DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 397 UD 016 652

AUTHOR Fenton, Calvin W.
TITLE Youth Monitoring and Self-Evaluation Services. Final Report.
INSTITUTION University Research Corp., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 30 Nov 70
CONTRACT OEO-B-99-4998
NOTE 152p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$8.69 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Evaluation Methods; Leadership; *Participant Involvement; Program Content; Program Coordination; *Program Descriptions; Program Design; Program Development; *Program Evaluation; *Self Evaluation; Social Action; Social Change; Youth Problems; *Youth Programs

ABSTRACT

Youth monitoring and self evaluation services were developed for fourteen youth programs in the Eastern Region, the mid-Western Region and the Western Region of the United States. The concept of youth involvement is central to these fourteen projects. Youth involvement is defined as "initial participation by project beneficiaries in the determination of the nature of their program and continuing participation in on-going managerial and policy-making activities." Its purpose is to enable project participants to find their place in community affairs through democratic experience and collective social action. A problem facing some of the projects is the lack of a clearcut relationship between the youth board and the adult boards. For this reason it is recommended that programs of youth involvement be continued, but that a new structure be developed to emphasize cooperation between youth and adult boards. Evaluation for each of the youth projects was provided by a third party. This report includes a detailed discussion of the evaluation process and emphasizes the use of evaluation as a tool for program improvement rather than as a measure of success or failure. Youth participating in all the programs included members of many ethnic groups and members of both sexes. Most participants were from poverty groups. (PR)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED133397

YOUTH MONITORING AND SELF-EVALUATION SERVICES

FINAL REPORT

NOVEMBER 30, 1970

CALVIN W. FENTON - PROJECT DIRECTOR

Performed under contract with the United States Office of Economic Opportunity, Youth Programs Research and Demonstration Section.

(B-99--4998)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

VT 016652

University Research Corporation, 4301 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Washington, D.C. 20008

DEC 20 1976

YOUTH MONITORING AND SELF-EVALUATION SERVICE

PERSONNEL

Calvin Fenton	Project Director
Ernest Middleton	Deputy Director
Elaine Hudson	Administrative Coordinator
Dan Robbin	Western Regional Coordinator
Conrad Graves	Eastern Regional Coordinator
William Pickard	Mid-Western Regional Coordinator

CONSULTANTS

Charles Grosser	James Goodman
Shirley Jones	Carolyn McCannon
Mae Churchill	Lloyd Johnson
Edward Dowdy	George Roemer
Terry Rose	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

Background. 1

Approach. 10

STATEMENT ON YOUTH INVOLVEMENT 15

Evaluation and Self-Evaluation: Some Questions about its Meaning, Uses, and Application to Social Action Programs. 23

The Evaluation Process 26

Why Self-Evaluation? 37

ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM REPORTS. 41

Youth Involvement 42

Boards and Adult-Youth Relationships. 75

Administration. 81

Leadership. 82

Self-Evaluation Design and Training 83

Self-Evaluation Program Activities. 88

Communications Media 98

Recreation 99

Economic Development and Job Training. 101

Services 103

PROJECT RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PLAN. 105

Historical Background 105

The Problem 109

Recommendations for the Implementation of an R&D Plan . . 116

APPENDICES 123

Appendix "A". 125

Appendix "B". 128

Appendix "C". 134

Appendix "D". 138

I N T R O D U C T I O N

BACKGROUND

University Research Corporation undertook the task of providing Technical Assistance and Self-Evaluation Services to fourteen (14) [1] Youth Programs underwritten by the Office of Economic Opportunity, awarded on July 1st, 1969.

The terms of this contract require the provision of the following services:

(1) To work closely with Local Youth Program staff in developing self-evaluation designs and techniques.

(2) To provide training for the implementation of such evaluative techniques.

(3) To provide the Office of Economic Opportunity with four quarterly reports throughout the Contract period, indicating the progress being made by local youth programs.

(4) To recommend to the Office of Economic Opportunity the various types of Technical Assistance required by each Youth Program.

1. Note that the National Recreation and Parks Association's program functioned in three separate locations, (Cincinnati, Baltimore and Yuma). Thus, fourteen (14) programs were serviced covering sixteen (16) sites.

(5) To undertake Feasibility Studies of Youth Program Development, the nature of which is to be determined by the Office of Economic Opportunity at some point during the Contract period. (A total of 20 consultation days were to be set aside for this purpose. Four feasibility studies were designated by OEO.)

(6) To provide OEO with an overall analysis at the end of the Contract period, which would provide a general frame of reference to determine the quality and quantity of Youth Program functioning.

During the initial stages of this Contract, eight (8) of the fourteen (14) youth programs designated by the Office of Economic Opportunity were being served by A.L. Nellum and Associates. Although the Nellum corporation provided Third Party Evaluation Services, rather than Self-Evaluation Services, it was mutually agreed upon by The Office of Economic Opportunity and University Research Corporation to await the termination of the above mentioned Contract before initiating contact with the eight Youth Programs covered in the Nellum Contract (termination date September 30, 1969). This was done in order to avoid confusion, and to allow each service to maintain its distinctive quality.

All Youth Programs designated by the Office of Economic Opportunity, Youth Demonstration and Research Section, are listed in the chart provided on page 5, of this report.

The Program Manager of OEO, Miss Jean Miller, has provided on-going consultation, and has greatly assisted the implementation of this contract.

During the period covered in this Report, OEO terminated the funding of Youth Programs in five cities, namely: Brockton, Massachusetts; Los Angeles and San Francisco, California; Dalles, Oregon; and Syracuse, New York. Brockton is not listed in the above mentioned Chart since this program terminated early during the contract period (before the agreed date to begin field work.). It should also be noted that no services were provided to the Mission Rebels in Action, San Francisco, California, and it is not listed because it terminated while being covered by the A. L. Nellum Contract.

Although consultation services were provided to New Communicators, Inc., of Los Angeles, prior to its termination it will not be included in this report. A full analysis of this program was provided in our second and third quarterly reports. Certain references will be made to this program within a general frame of reference; however, special emphasis will be given to programs to which we provided on-going coverage.

It should be noted that a follow-up study was undertaken for New Communicators, Inc., which attempted to determine the effect of their training program and the disposition of program participants following completion of the training program. This task was undertaken several months following program termination. The result of this effort is described in our third quarterly report.

Of the five youth programs terminated during the contract period, self-evaluation and/or monitoring services were provided in: Los Angeles, California; Dalles, Oregon; and Syracuse, New York.

Following a re-evaluation of the cities designated by OEO in the original Contract Agreement, new cities were substituted for coverage, all of which are designated in the Chart.

The fourteen (14) Youth Programs served were assigned to three geographical regions: Eastern--URC Regional Office in New York City ; Mid-Western--based in Columbus, Ohio; and Western--URC Regional Office in San Francisco, California . Three (3) Regional Coordinators were employed to oversee Youth Programs assigned to the respective regions. Program consultants were also employed, where necessary, to provide on-going consultation to Youth Programs which could not be covered by the Regional Coordinator for various reasons.

LIST OF YOUTH PROGRAMS MONITORED BY THE YOUTH MONITORING CONTRACT

EASTERN REGION

NAME OF PROJECT	ADDRESS	PROJECT DIRECTOR	DISPOSITION
1. Hartranft Multi-Purpose Youth Development Project	2328 Germantown Ave. Philadelphia, Pa. 19133	Paul Thomas	Extended
2. Projection '70, Inc.	501 Clarendon St. Syracuse, New York	C. Stanley Hunterton	Extended
3. The Real Great Society Community Fashion Industries	69 Suffolk Street New York, New York 10002	Robert Rivera	Extended
4. Commission of Human Relations Youth Board	1420 Tampa Street Tampa, Florida	James Campbell	Extended
5. The School of Philadelphia Board of Education Site: 12th and Oxford	1550 North 7th Philadelphia, Pa. 19103	James Robinson	Extended
6. National Recreation and Parks Association Site: The Martin Luther King Recreation Center	122 North Vincent St. Baltimore, Md. 21223	Myrtle Bailey	Extended

MID-WESTERN REGION

7.	Youth Civic Center	966-1/2 East Main St. Columbus, Ohio 43205	LeRoy Tolliver	Extended
8.	National Recreation and Parks Association Site: Lincoln Center	Clark & Court Sts. on Linn St. Cincinnati, Ohio	Mrs. Sue Thomas	Extended
9.	Dayton Youth Patrol	1451 West 3rd Street Dayton, Ohio 45407	Harold J. Wright	Extended

WESTERN REGION

10.	Neighborhood House Communications Project	321 Alamo Avenue Richmond, California	Joe Polito	Extended
11.	Mid-Columbia Youth for Progress, Inc.	P.O. Box 727 Dalles, Oregon 97058	Rita Kulick	Terminated
12.	Colonias Del Valle Work-Study Research Project	P.O. Box 907 Colonias Del Valle San Juan, Texas	Alex Moreno	Extended

13.	National Recreation and Parks Association Site: Carver Community Park & Recreation Center	Carver Park, 5th St. & 13th A. Yuma, Arizona	Thelma Elvoid	Extended
14.	New Communicators Inc.	6211 Hollywood Blvd. Los Angeles, California	Fred Nobles	Terminated

. . . . . .

LIST OF CONSULTANTS PROVIDING ON-GOING PROGRAM COVERAGE

YOUTH PROGRAM	PROGRAM CONSULTANT
EASTERN REGION	
1) HARTRANFT MULTI-PURPOSE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, Philadelphia, Pa.	CONRAD GRAVES
2) PROJECTION '70 INC. Syracuse, New York	Lloyd Johnson
3) THE REAL GREAT SOCIETY- COMMUNITY FASHION INDUSTRIES New York, N.Y.	Conrad Graves
4) COMMISSION OF HUMAN RELATIONS YOUTH BOARD Tampa, Florida	Lloyd Johnson
5) 12TH & OXFORD, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Conrad Graves
6) NATIONAL RECREATION AND PARKS ASSOCIATION Site: THE MARTIN LUTHER KING RECREATION CENTER, Baltimore, Maryland	Shirley Jones
MID-WESTERN REGION	
7) YOUTH CIVIC CENTER, Columbus, Ohio	William Pickard
8) NATIONAL RECREATION AND PARKS ASSOCIATION Site: LINCOLN CENTER, Cincinnati, Ohio	William Pickard

9)	DAYTON YOUTH PATROL Dayton, Ohio	William Pickard

WESTERN REGION

10)	NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE Richmond, California	Dan Robbin
11)	MID-COLUMBIA YOUTH FOR PROGRESS, INC. Dalles, Oregon	James Goodman and Dan Robbin
12)	COLONIAS DEL VALLE San Juan, Texas	Dan Robbin
13)	NATIONAL RECREATION AND PARKS ASSOCIATION Site: CARVER RECREATION CENTER Yuma, Arizona	Dan Robbin
14)	NEW COMMUNICATORS, INC. Los Angeles, California	George Roemer

. . . . . .

APPROACH

This report is divided into four distinct sections and is intended to provide a general frame of reference for understanding the nature of youth program functioning throughout the contract period. The indroduction is directed toward acquainting the reader with the posture and general conditions under which the contract was implemented. The second section offers position papers which attempt to provide the reader with general background information related to the concept of "Youth Involvement" and the problems and issues related to evaluation and self-evaluation. Section three (3), "The Analysis of Program Reports,"is divided into six distinct sections, all of which are organized around the central theme of youth involvement. The first section of this chapter specifically deals with the extent to which youth were, in fact, involved in each program. This section also includes a blend of the hard data collected from each program throughout the contract period. The areas of interest which follows in this chapter are: program activity; Boards and Adult-Youth Relationships; Administration; Leadership; and Self-Evaluation and Training.

The fourth and final chapter represents our recommendations for future activities on the part of the Office of Economic Opportunity in supporting Research and Demonstration programs. It should be noted that by contractual agreement, we were to undertake four(4) feasibility studies of youth programs, as designated by the office of Economic Opportunity. Twenty(20) days of consultation were set aside for this purpose. In April of 1970 the project manager of OEO indicated that in lieu of

this requirement, OEO would benefit from the development of a sample Research and Demonstration plan which could provide some direction to the future activities of this section of the agency. Following several conferences with various OEO officials this plan was completed and submitted. The fourth section of this report represents an expansion of some of the basic concepts previously offered and a summary of our recommendations.

During the contract period, three(3) staff conferences were held to discuss various issues related to the provision of consultation services to youth programs. Two conferences were held in New York City during October of 1969 and the second in January of 1970. Representatives from the Office of Economic Opportunity attended both conferences and were extremely helpful in assisting us think through the nature and quality of consultation services being provided.

Our staff convened once again by telephone conference in June of 1970. The major purpose of this conference was to firmly establish our position in terms of the collection of hard data from each youth program. Considerable discussion also took place related to how each program could be formally assisted in developing data collection systems.

The specific design for the collection of hard data was finally cleared with the program manager of the Office of Economic Opportunity in June of 1970. The results of im-

plementing this design may be found in chapter three(3) of this report, as part of the Youth Involvement Section. This information is offered to support the content of the analysis provided for each program. A brief summary of hard data is also provided reflecting the nature of certain stipulated program groupings. The specific design used is offered in Appendix "A" of this report.

It should be noted that in certain cases the collection of hard data was hampered by the inability of various programs to overcome significant problems covering a wide variety of issues throughout the contract period.

During the initial stages of the contract, reporting forms were developed which could provide a systematic frame of reference for determining the progress being made by each Youth Program. This activity was undertaken to develop a "PROJECT PROFILE" (see Appendix "B") for each Youth Program which would provide a solid base for determining at what point a particular Youth Program was functioning and developing during the initial stage of our intervention.

After from two (2) to four (4) visits were made to each program, the "Project Profile" was completed and filed for future reference.

Following the establishment of Project Profiles for each youth program, monthly site visits were made to trace basic program

changes and modifications as they developed and to provide Technical Assistance as required. A second form was developed to accomplish this purpose, namely The Site Visit Report, (see Appendix "C"). This form used the basic topical headings designated in the Project Profile; however, site visits reports, following the completion of a Project Profile, only reported changes in program direction. This information also provides a base for analyzing the development and progress various youth programs experienced throughout the grant period. This also assisted youth programs in developing a process of self-evaluation.

Our Third Quarterly report included a "Final Project Profile" for each youth program serviced during the contract period. This was done in order to provide the reader with a comparative view of the disposition of each program serviced prior to our intervention and desposition after several months of program operations.

STATEMENT ON YOUTH INVOLVEMENT

What we mean by Youth Involvement is initial participation by project beneficiaries in the determination of the nature of their programs and continuing participation in on-going managerial and policy-making activities.

This commitment entails a change in orientation regarding the reasons young people fail to become integrated into the community. For decades, workers in all phases of Youth Programming have focused on the provision of services geared to treatment, enrichment, the teaching of skill and socialization. Such programs were provided to rehabilitate youngsters seen as "disturbed", "pathological" or "anti-social". This approach, endemic to correctional, recreational, and treatment agencies, focused on changing the individual so that he could effectively cope with his social, educational, and vocational environment.

Since World War II, and especially in the last decade, youth workers (along with many others) have come to see the limits of this approach. First, it was increasingly apparent that successful rehabilitation

came to naught when opportunities for employment or education remained closed.

Since programs were rendered impotent when opportunities for full citizenship were denied, even to such commonplace facilities as public accommodations, it also became apparent that the vast majority of young people in marginal positions in our communities were not disadvantaged as a result of personal failures or inadequacies.

Youth workers came to see that conditions of social, political, educational, and employment inequality significantly affected the failure of young people to assume conventional social roles. The recognition of social inequity as a major determinant of youth deviance forced the consideration of social reforms (to achieve equity) as a strategy for dealing with youth problems.

Thus, the need to make local institutions equally responsible to and involve all sections of the population was recognized as an essential component of any youth project. This socio-structural component co-exists with -- it does not replace -- the rehabilitative elements in the programs. Each component is rendered ineffective by the absence of the other.

Early comprehensive youth projects attempted to achieve explicitly stated goals regarding changing such social institutions as Educational and Employment Opportunity Systems. The amount of local conflict engendered by such direct approaches soon rendered them obsolete.

Being unable to directly confront elements in the environment which produced social pathology, youth projects were forced to avoid explicit statements regarding social-structural change. This occurred, even though it had been widely acknowledged that such change was basic to any successful youth program.

.....

In an attempt to find a viable way in which to maintain a social action component, projects increasingly turned to youth participation as a device which would provide a focus on the social environment. If the project itself, through youth involvement, could be a unique entity that differed substantially from other local institutions; if the project were truly responsive to youth needs, making no invidious designations or exclusions; then this, in and of itself, would provide something of an environmental change. Youth participation in the shaping and management of their own project is no sub-

stitute for their participation in local school agencies, political parties, and the like.

The virtue of youth participation is that it is reflective of the democratic ethos, is universally acceptable, and it provides young people with some opportunity for shaping their lives. It is because Youth Involvement remains as the only attempt at dealing with environmental factors open to the projects that it is currently seen as the sine qua non of a successful youth program.

Through successful participation in project management and policy making, youth may very well be encouraged to venture forth into other aspects of the democratic process. If, federally-sponsored programs can adhere to the tenants of pluralistic democratic process, young people may be encouraged to seek similar experiences in other social and political spheres. Such participation and experience is the very essence of social reform.

.....

Youth project members will understand that the changes called forth by their efforts will be modest. They will know, too, when tokenism and the illusion of change are substituted for substantive concessions.

Youth projects are modest measures, conducted on a local level to enhance opportunities for social success. Such projects should not be seen by their federal sponsors as shaking the social structure of the nation, or redistributing its resources -- even when they press for a substantive reordering of local priorities.

Youth involvement is also basic to project success. Programmatically, participants will have a commitment to, and stake in, programs which they helped form, whereas they will remain uninvolved in, and untouched by, programs imposed and managed by adults and institutional officers.

Young people know themselves and their problems. Given the opportunity, they will introduce relevant program components which reflect their life experience.

The wisdom and insight that comes from being indigenous to the community and its problems cannot

be found in expertise or officialdom. This in no way denigrates the substantial contribution to be made by trained personnel.

Youth are most receptive to help provided on their terms that is reflective of their own priorities. What has sometimes appeared to be resistance to outside help is actually resistance to the unrelatedness, not the competence of, the helper. Youth involvement avoids this pitfall, and provides a basis on which adult technical assistance can be effectively used.

.....

The young people whom we seek to reach through Youth Programs are those who, as a result of unsatisfactory experiences with existing local institutions, have withdrawn from conventional community life into understandable-- and often justifiable-- alienation and hostility.

These young people cannot be reached by the very institutions and adults who are seen as having rejected them or blocked their access to opportunity. Even with the incentives and innovations of a Federal R & D grant, the local institutions remain suspect on the basis of

past performance.

Youth involvement deals with this impasse in two ways: first, it is tangible evidence that the existing arrangements are being modified. Second, and even more important, it provides a vehicle whereby youth can approach other youth -- thus bridging the gap of distrust and hostility which often separates programs from those who will use them.

The democratic process, in and of itself, is fraught with risk and uncertainties. Totalitarianism and oligarchy can guarantee, though only for a time, stability and predictability.

Youth involvement unquestionably introduces an element of risk into a project. Such risk, however, can be avoided only at the expense of the project's ability to reach and affect young people. Youth involvement is, after all, only another designation for the democratic ethic which will inevitably determine the success of any social institution in American society.

To seek such meaningful participation by young people in their programs is only to ask that they fulfill their basic responsibilties as citizens.

Providing such opportunities to youth, who may have reason to believe that they do not exist, is surely the way to induct them into community life.

And, conversely, denying such opportunities to youth who may have reason to believe such opportunities do not in fact exist, thereby confirming their belief -- is even more certainly increasing their alienation.

EVALUATION AND SELF EVALUATION: SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT ITS MEANING, USES, AND APPLICATION TO SOCIAL ACTION PROGRAMS

Typically the guidelines of OEO Youth Research and Demonstration programs and those of other federal agencies stipulate that plans for the evaluation of the program should be included in the proposal offered for federal funding. In most cases, the applying agency or organization either neglects to address this requirement or promises that it will be accomplished at some point during the grant period. This requirement is usually viewed by the applicant as just one more bureaucratic bottleneck which the program will somehow have to overcome within a few months following initial funding.

If a formal evaluation design is included in the initial application, it is most likely the product of an overstated promise made by a private firm or professional consultant who is unrelated to the program, whose product is developed merely to meet a funding requirement, and who usually has no involvement in the implementation of the design formula.

In the case of OEO youth programs serviced during the contract year, the evaluation requirement had another dimension of confusion. In the previous year (1968-69), the evaluation requirement was assumed by the Office of Economic Opportunity (the funding agency). In this case, OEO let a single contract to carry out the evaluation of all youth programs funded during that period.

At the time this contract was announced, (Youth Monitoring and Self Evaluation Services) there was no official determination by OEO that this procedure would continue to be followed and this issue was never resolved throughout the contract year. Consequently, some programs had to arrange for a third party to develop a design and plan for evaluation within a prescribed period of time (usually 90 days after funding) and other programs were merely required to cooperate with whatever arrangement the funding agency made for their evaluation. And, as stated above, this was never fully realized.

It should be noted, however, whoever makes the arrangement for the evaluation of the program (whether it is the funding agency or the grantee), it is understood that it must be carried out by an "objective third party".

The third party evaluation process is basically directed towards reporting to the grantor the degree to which program objectives are being fulfilled, the degree to which agency guidelines are being met, and the degree to which the program has been effective. Unfortunately the grantee usually percieves the evaluator as a "spy for the Feds," rather than as a friend of the program. The evaluation process should be viewed by the grantee as a method by which program problems and issues can be brought to the surface and handled openly. This process should be viewed by the grantor as an attempt to gain important information and knowledge regarding the implementation of specific program concepts. It is apparent however

that both parties (grantee and grantor) are somewhat overwhelmed with attempting to determine program "success and failure" and thus misuse the function of evaluation.

Another critical issue related to third party evaluation is that often the grantor and the grantee view and interpret program goals and objectives differently. As a result, the evaluation process produces conclusions which may be weighed differently by the grantee and the grantor. To further complicate this set of circumstances more often than not personnel within the funding agency often differ in their own perceptions of program objectives and program implementation. Thus, the grantee and evaluator are projected into a confused set of circumstances from which they cannot be extricated.

THE EVALUATION PROCESS

The complicated, ill-defined process of program evaluation requires considerable thought in order to obtain a clear view of the problems and issues which lie at the heart of carrying out this task.

The following represents a set of definitions offered by OEO in order to clarify terms relevant to the Research and Demonstration mission.

1. "Research consists of systematic analyses of the causes of poverty and evidence on the relationships between economic, social, educational and political factors and the incidence of poverty or the equality of opportunity.

2. Experimentation is the examination of a clearly-stated hypothesis through controlled variation of policy instruments. Generally experimentation will utilize well designed control or reference groups.

3. Developmental projects are intended to transform accepted hypotheses concerning program objectives and means into workable program models. Emphasis is placed upon the development of administrative procedures and program and training materials. Developmental projects should usually be undertaken in clusters so that alternative project designs may be examined. An evaluation design should be an integral part of the program.

4. Demonstration projects are primarily a means of demonstrating a proven program concept. Their function is, in large part, the dissemination of information concerning these concepts. "[1]

Within the context of these definitions, OEO has required that

---

[1] OEO Memorandum dated 4/7/70 "Definitions of Research, Experimentation, Development and Demonstration," Thomas K. Glennan Jr., Director of Research.

third party evaluations be undertaken to gain some understanding of the development and implementation of such programs.

According to Webster (Unabridged), "to evaluate is to ascertain or fix the value or amount of something; to appraise carefully." This clearly implies the existence of criteria by which the value can be judged. In the case of Social Action Programs, such as those undertaken by the Office of Economic Opportunity, are such criteria defined anywhere? If so, what are they?

Inasmuch as OEO Programs are presumably innovative, i.e., without precedent, how are the criteria to be established? By whom? Consider the possibilities: Criteria may be established by legislative fiat, by the funding agency, by the program innovators, by the program operators who are not necessarily the same as the program innovators; and, last but not least, by the group to be served by the program.

A case could be made for using any of the means named above, but it is obvious that the criteria chosen would vary according to the source. Any set of criteria might have some utility, provided that it was clearly defined, understood, and accepted by all parties concerned.

Has any mechanism been developed to achieve such clarity of assessment in OEO programs? The question can, with equal relevance, be raised with respect to the entire gamut of governmental programs. OEO is politically more vulnerable than most government agencies--not necessarily more culpable, however. It would be interesting to see, for example, how Department of Defense Programs are "evaluated"; by whom the criteria are established; at what stage in their operation is their effectiveness judged; and the consequences of a negative evaluation.

Questions of time quickly emerge when one starts considering the meaning of "Evaluation". Are we concerned with the immediate value of a given program? Or, must some distinction be made between short-range and long-range results? How can one judge the long-range consequences of a program with a life-span of one year, or perhaps, if it is lucky, two years, as in the case of demonstration programs?

Inasmuch as the new programs are presumably created in order to meet unfilled needs, and hence are unprecedented in one or another crucial aspect, does it make sense to attempt to judge the operation on a short-run basis when most of the time elapsed is, of necessity, a learning experience for all concerned? What allowance can or should be made for the element of insecurity built into the year-by-year funding process characterizing OEO programs?

It must be apparent that the built-in insecurity of demonstration programs must affect the quality of personnel available for administering programs, and that this in turn is reflected in the operation of the program. In fact, one-year, or even two-year

grants with which to demonstrate new services, or new combinations of services, contain an implied threat-- make it look good, or else!

Experience indicates that, under these circumstances, the management of innovative programs is left to those persons in our society who are, for one reason or another, unequipped for dealing with the complexity of the situations for which they take responsibility. Most people with training, experience, and/or some political sophistication, tend to avoid such responsibility. We thus are faced with a paradox: the most difficult undertaking, i.e., those without established precedent and traditions which might conceivably be made to work if the most dedicated, accomplished practitioners in the field were operating them are left to those willing to take on incredibly complex duties-- with a minimum of background, experience and judgement.

In addition, these innocent innovators can usually count not upon cooperation from the more knowing professionals in the field but much more certainly on their opposition, concealed or open. And, to add insult to injury, the professionals have managed not only to escape operating responsibility with all its trauma, but they have also managed to become the outside evaluators of the innovative programs.

If, somehow, criteria were clearly established by which a program could be evaluated, the question remains: who can best measure the extent to which the criteria are met? Proposals are frequently written by a person or persons with one set of goals in mind, operated initially by still another group, not infre-

quently taken over by a third group, and evaluated by an outside organization. Whose judgement then is the relevant one?

The outside evaluation generally consists of a flying visit lasting a couple of days, during which the visitors talk with as many participants in the program as possible-- getting thoroughly confused in the process-- and adding to the confusion normally present in groups struggling for survival, in which the struggle for control is a parallel contest. With the best intentions in the world, the flying visit by outside consultants can hardly be expected to produce a measured objective judgement and the consultants become crucial in deciding the fate of the program. Its operators will, of necessity, put as good a face on their activities as is possible and opposition elements within program, hoping perhaps to gain control and succeed to the Management or key spots within the organization, will feed their own brand of information to the consultants.

Objectively verifiable data are usually scarce-- and for good reason. Funding agencies' concern with evaluation has rarely extended to including proper budget items needed for careful data collection, record-keeping, analysis, etc.-- with the result that most information available to the outside evaluators is narrative and much of it is fiction.

In fairness to the funding agencies, it should also be added that, with innovative programs, the difficulties of designing good evaluative research are real. Without a certain amount of

experience and knowing the major variables-- how do we know a good research design for an experimental program when we see it? Furthermore, here too, even a good design is not sufficient. What is needed is intelligent execution of the design. There is very little reason to believe that the importance or uses of evaluative research have been accepted by most participants in social action programs. The gap here between the theorists and the operators is enormous .

Until the gap is narrowed, it is just plain silly to expect persons struggling with the day-to-day problems of trying to make a program work also attend to conceptual and archival problems of evaluative research, particularly since intuition and experience suggest that information collected can as readily be used against a program as in its favor.

.....

Ideally, Social Research is modeled along experimental lines, with variables identified, controls provided for contrast, etc. But, in practice, such design is rarely built into demonstration programs. There are sound human and political reasons for the omission . Most people involved in Social Action Programs are ill-disposed to the role of subjects-- not even for the best of social science reasons. As Peter Rossi, an outstanding scholar in the field has observed:

"... Few evaluation researches employ controlled experiments as their basic research design...

"It is important to understand that a key reason for this condition lies not so much in the difficulty of designing such experiments, but in the impediments to their use in practice....

"Perhaps the major obstacles to the use of controlled experiments in evaluation research is a political one ... namely, that practitioners are extremely reluctant to allow experimenters to exercise proper controls over the allocation of potential subjects to experimental and control groups...

"For example, the proper evaluation of the Job Corps would require that potential trainees be separated into experimental and control groups, the former receiving either no treatment at all, or some sort of training differing in essential respects from Job Corps treatment...

"The political sore point is that a controlled experiment means that some potential trainees who are otherwise qualified, are barred arbitrarily from training, an act which public agencies are extremely reluctant to authorize.[2]"

An equally basic problem in evaluation arises from the very fact that OEO programs are essentially interstitial in nature. That is, Congress created OEO originally for the purpose of "coordinating" anti-poverty programs already in existence throughout the federal government. That it was never meant to supplant existing programs or to create basic

---

2. Rossi, Peter, Practice, Method and Theory in Evaluating Social Action Programs. Paper read at 1966 meeting of the American Statistical Association, pp. 14-15

new services is clear, not only from the legislation but from the budgetary allotments as well.

It is very much more difficult to evaluate a coordinating mechanism than it is to evaluate a single, distinct service. It is also very much more difficult to isolate any effects whatsoever from marginal programs dealing with small, special groups, by definition excluded from the mainstream of existing services. Peter Rossi has labeled this program as that of "weak effects".

OEO programs, planned to "coordinate", to "supplement", to "rehabilitate", are aimed for the most part at individuals, not systems. Their effects, therefore, are not systematic, but slight. Slight effects are either immeasurable, or extremely difficult to measure, calling for the most refined of measurement techniques. Thus, for example, adding a special form of social service or of training to parallel the much broader existing services may produce benefits which, though real to the relatively few individuals involved here, are virtually invisible, statistically. Rossi's analysis, concludes:--

> "... new treatments can be expected to yield only marginal improvements over existing treatments, and

hence cost-benefit ratios can be expected to rise dramatically as target problems and populations constitute smaller and smaller fractions of their universes...

"When only marginal effects are to be expected, evaluation becomes more difficult to achieve and at the same time, program administrators can be expected to be more and more apprehensive concerning the outcome of evaluative research...

"Effective new treatments which produce more than equivocal results can be expected to be expensive ... To compound difficulties, the costs of evaluation for programs which are marginally effective are more expensive (for the same quality) than for programs which are very effective...

"If effects can be expected to be small, then greater precision is needed in Research to demonstrate their existence unequivocally... However, although with the best of research we could show very slight results-- with the worst of research we could show anything. [3]"

If further proof is needed of the marginal nature of OEO Programs as the subject for Evaluative Research, consider

---

3. Op. cit, p.6.

the following : OEO has identified some 156 other programs administered by at least 15 other federal agencies, including programs for Education, Manpower, Health, Welfare, Social Security, Housing, Urban Renewal, and also Economic Development.

All of the foregoing agencies make direct contributions to the anti-poverty effort. In 1967, the President's budget recommendations included estimated expenditures of $21,000,000,000 for Federal benefits and services to the poor from administrative budget and trust funds. Of these, OEO expenditures comprised $1.6 billion, or 7.5 per cent.

The "lion's share" of anti-poverty funds thus clearly went to well-established agencies-- with special emphases long established by Congressional mandate. The feasibility of evaluating OEO's contribution to the general anti-poverty effort, or, in specific instances, the impact of any given OEO program within the larger categories of federal action, becomes highly dubious.

Perhaps different terminology would be helpful: "Evaluation" is a weighty word, with implications of precision and controlled methodology somewhat less than appropriate as applied to OEO programs. Does it follow then, from this, that no attempt should be made to assess the quality of the performance? Perhaps too, it would be helpful to consider that the essential judgement with respect to any given program is made at the point of deciding that it is worthy of funding; that, if it is funded, serious effort should be made to incorporate into the program a system

of Management tools, essentially Operations Research designed to help inexperienced staff continuously judge how the program is working and to make correction possible before their cumulative effect has become ruinous; to provide constant feed back between program operators and the group served with systematic record-keeping for the sake of all concerned.

This might not meet the needs of the professional social scientists, or even those of the GAO's office-- but it might help those persons innocent or heroic enough to attempt to do what no one has done before.

WHY SELF-EVALUATION ?

Youth Programs cannot be singularly indicted for not attempting to systematically evaluate and review their direction and status at any given point in time.

Most Research and Demonstration Programs, whatever their nature, are guilty of the same crime, that is -- the need to prove that they have had a "successful" program experience.

This need to establish "program credibility" has often led to the avoidance of reporting the basic problems and issues related to program development and program implementation. Unretrievable knowledge is lost in the process.

It is our feeling that the fear of failure must be diminished and thirst for information and knowledge emphasized. A "success story" produces little that can be used by others unless it is reported within the context of the very real problems and issues related to program development and program implementation.

Federal Demonstration and Research Agencies have learned little in the Social Sciences, primarily because of their insistence on having a "success story", and the limitation of one-year funding. Certainly, "success stories" assist federal agencies in acquiring bigger and better new legislation, authorization, and appropriations. However, the political ramifications of continued funding negates a position of complete, honest reporting. Honest reporting should be rewarded -- not punished .

Self-evaluation can provide a frame of reference for the systematic utilization of self-investigation, review, and conscious program direction. Unfortunately, most demonstration programs neither have the resources nor the time to undertake the luxury of such procedures.

The urgency of success weighs heavily on Program Operations. Thus, the "final product" becomes the essential goal -- and the "process" is lost.

Self-evaluation represents a means by which a project can review its own experience without the threat of a flying two (2) day visit by a third party evaluation team which is required to make judgement about the degree to which a program is successful in

accomplishing its goals.

The concept of self-evaluation is based on a conscious review by the program staff in determining where they have been and where they are going. The specific design used for self-evaluation is not significant. The importance of this process remains in the concept of self-investigation, self-direction, and a willingness to report what one experiences.

The basic concept in self-evaluation is the development of a fearless honesty in looking at one's self and the capacity to sharply report what is seen.

The self-evaluation and third party evaluation are not mutually exclusive procedures. They can and should provide youth programs with a wide variety of supportive measures directed towards developing knowledge, information, and direction. The implementation of both procedures within the context of a single youth program, however, can be quite confusing if not undertaken with considerable clarity and understanding on the part of all parties involved in the process.

ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM REPORTS

The experiences of the fourteen (14)[1] projects included in the monitoring grant are extraordinarily varied. The projects themselves were located in a dozen different cities, each of which influenced the program through different complex interactions. Furthermore, the projects themselves differed in that some had been in existence for a number of years and others were hastily put together. While youth were involved in all of the projects, in some they were the central core and in others they functioned as part of a larger community coalition. Some projects were located in small or rural communities while others were in giant urban industrial centers. The programs in which the projects were engaged included recreation, film making, public health, training, and business ventures.

The differences enumerated suggest the sweep of divergence which characterized the projects under contract. They are not meant, nor do they begin, to inventory those differences. This section of the report will attempt to analyze the program experience of the projects under contract. In so doing, it will necessarily make certain generalizations which do not sufficiently account for individual project differences. To the extent that it is possible, an attempt will be made to acknowledge differences and to account for them. It should be noted that detailed and unique project materials are contained in the individual volumes which comprise the third quarterly report submitted to O.E.O. This report will attempt to draw generalizations from specific experiences which appear significant and can serve to

---

1. As indicated previously "New Communicators Inc." will not be contained in this analysis.

provide replicable information to federal agencies with regard to funding and program policies.

Attention will be given to those areas central to the concerns of the projects and the central funding agency; these will include funding and administration, self evaluation, youth adult relationships,particularly with regard to policy making and accountability, program activity, and the local boards of directors. Because of the centrality of youth involvement to all the projects under contract, this area will be considered first in some detail. The areas discussed subsequently will implicitly relate to the central issue of youth involvement. Explicit references between the other aspects of program and youth involvement will be made as needed.

YOUTH INVOLVEMENT

As noted in the position paper offered in the first section of this report and as indicated in the OEO guidelines, youth involvement is the central facet of the Research and Demonstration projects under discussion. The most recent guidelines for youth programs (effective March 5, 1970) devotes the major portion of its twelve pages to this subject and to issues related to it. The guidelines state explicitly that youth involvement is a key goal. The overall goals of youth development programs are stated as follows:

> "Provide poor youth with a formal voice in planning and implementing programs in which youth increase their ability to deal with problems affecting their lives.

Through collective social action, especially on behalf of their own community or neighborhood, bring about positive changes in their values, aspirations and behavior.

Prepare youth to deal more effectively with the institutions designed to serve them, and by speaking together, to become instrumental not only in expressing their needs to those institutions, but also in being able to orderly change them in order to improve the quality of life in their neighborhoods." *

Thus, youth involvement is projected as a device which will enable excluded young people to find their way into the central core of community affairs through democratic experience and collective social action. With the exception of the National Recreation and Parks Association projects, about which we shall comment later, all of the contract projects contained substantive youth involvement components. Consistant with the points made earlier regarding the broad range of experience encompassed by these programs, this component varied from virtually total youth control and involvement on every level in the Real Great Society in New York City, to struggle for youth participation and option in the Neighborhood House project in Richmond California. Before drawing generalizations from the aggregate experience of the contract projects we shall comment briefly on the youth involvement components of each. It should also be noted that following our comments on each program in this section, a presentation of hard data is provided which offers information related to the general characteristics of program participants.

---

* OEO insert 6168-1A

I YOUTH CIVIC CENTER, COLUMBUS, OHIO

The Youth Civic Center has had a functioning youth board and extensive youth involvement from its inception as part of the East Columbus Community Organization (ECCO). This program began in 1965 under the aegis of the English Lutheran Church. At that time considerable effort was vested in involving the youth community in the creation and formulation of their own program. Having set this early precedent, the youth themselves, the community, f u n d i n g agencies, and local community institutions then struggled with the presence and the contribution of the youth. Since the youth center was itself conceived by the youngsters and effectively brought to life through their active participation, they were optimistic regarding their ability to substantially effect events concerning it.

In addition to serving as Board members of the youth program, the youth also were elected as Board members and as committee members of the adult organization. At one point, youth had majority control of this Board. However, it was difficult for them to sustain their interest. Until recently, when some issues of consequence were handled by the ECCO board in a way unsatisfactory to the youth, the youth delegates attended ECCO meetings rarely and participated erratically.

The youth program is under the responsibility of the Youth Board which is composed of nine members, all under the age of 25.

This board meets regularly and sets policy for the program. All staff members are youth with the exception of the program director and deputy director. The working relationship between the youth and the adult director is such that all decision making is a joint process. Members of the youth program are also on the Executive committee of the adult board.

YOUTH CIVIC CENTER HARD DATA

I.	TOTAL PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS	500
II.	AGE Range 16-24	
III.	SEX	25% Female 75% Male
IV.	MARITAL STATUS	80% Single 20% Married Average family size 5.2
V.	SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS	40% below the federal poverty level. Substantial number on public assistance.
VI.	ETHNIC BACKGROUND	100% Black
VII.	EDUCATION	50% Completed 4 years of High School. 25% Less than 4 years of High School. 25% Unknown
VIII.	PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE	33% Unemployed.

II. DAYTON YOUTH PATROL, DAYTON, OHIO

The Dayton Youth Patrol was an offshoot of the indigenous "White Hat Patrol" which was formed as a part of the resolution of the Civic disturbances in Dayton. Under the strong charismatic leadership of the Executive Director and his two assistant directors, and in response to the dramatic events which gave the project birth, widespread youth involvement in the program developed in a genuine, though personalistic, manner around this leadership. This was facilitated by substantive commitment of the director to the involvement of youth members at all levels of the project, managerial, staff recipient and neighborhood. Youth involvement is frequently frustrated in the face of strong charismatic leadership. However, when such leadership is truly committed to participation by youth, it facilitates the process by adding the weight and prestige of the leader to the ideas and thoughts of the neophyte participants. This is in effect what occurred in Dayton. The project executive, highly respected in his own community and in the community at large, lent his office to the participants in the patrol so that, through him, involvement by youth in the community as a whole took place. As is frequently the case, at many programs of this nature, the youth leadership tended to be more actively involved than general membership. An unfortunate decision which probably exacerbated this state of affairs was the discontinuance of general membership meetings. The Patrol is going through that organizational

phase where the charismatic leadership and the intensity of crisis, which gave it birth and supported it in its early stages, is being replaced by organizational structure and regularized ongoing programs. The Board of the Patrol consists of twenty members, 50% adults and 50% youth. Although it formally sets policy for the program, this responsibility is informally held by the director. With the exception of the director, all staff are youth, and the decision-making is held by the director and the young leaders.

DAYTON YOUTH PATROL HARD DATA

I.	TOTAL TRAINEES	120
II.	SEX	55% Male 45% Female
III.	AGE	Range 15-35 22 average
IV.	MARITAL STATUS	2% married 98% single
V.	SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS	100% low income
VI.	ETHNIC BACKGROUND	98% Black 2% White

Job Placement Program estimated placements per year - 400 approximately.

The following is a sample of 50 people placed on jobs in the past year:

Age	Range 15-35	20 Average
Sex		90% Male 10% Female
Marital Status		Unknown
Socio-Economic Status		low income
Ethnic Background		100% Black

Of 50 people, 40 had no previous work experience.

III MID-COLUMBIA YOUTH FOR PROGRESS, THE DALLES, OREGON

Youth for Progress was never operational during the time it was covered by this contract,having received a short term (three months) planning grant. However, the grant request itself grew out of the indigenous activity of a group of local youth and the plan submitted was drawn directly by the youth, albeit a small number of them. This latter fact is something of an accomplishment, for there have been very few opportunities for the youth themselves to substantively draw their own program proposals. (Several exceptions are included in the projects under contract,i.e. Real Great Society and Youth Civic Center). The board executive and membership structure proposed by Y.F.P. provided for substantial youth involvement in the program submitted. Local adults approved this arrangement though it became clear that their approval was based on the expectation that the project would never be funded. When, in fact, funding appeared possible, a series of abandonments ensued as group after group of adults withdrew their support. The planning grant itself, by its unfulfilled promise ,turned the youngsters away from substantive program to developing a proposal. Once this proposal was subject to indefinite delay and became a matter of local politics, the planners had no plan and therefore no program and they soon melted away. The Dalles represents an example of lip service to youth involvement by adults ultimately defeating the notion itself.

No hard data is available for this program since it was a planning effort only and no youth council was ever functional.

IV. COMMISSION OF HUMAN RELATIONS YOUTH BOARD, TAMPA, FLORIDA

Like the Dayton Project, the Tampa program had its genesis in the White Hat Patrol which operated during the demonstrations which shook that city in 1967. The Commission on Community Relations which sponsored that effort sought to involve young people in the life of the community as an alternative to civil disorder and as a method of redressing grievances and achieving social reform. Though generally not publicly acknowledged, the fact is that in both Dayton and Tampa, youth involvement(and the Patrol) were devices offered to cool off aggrieved citizens (mostly youth) who had taken to the streets. Though in other cities this has also been the case, it is rare that the connection the instrument created to restore order became the organization of constructive social action. Youth involvement offered, as it were, under the gun may be as genuine and comprehensive as when it is provided as a matter of conviction.

While the mechanics of local youth participation were built into the original proposal, actual involvement proceeded moderately. However, by the summer of 1969, the constituency participated in electing a youth board of Directors which meets regularly and appears to exercise the prerogatives of a policy-making body. It is composed of 23 youths between the ages of 17-24 and meets on a weekly basis. In the course of this year, the board determined how the project shall proceed regarding several of its businesses, expanded its constituency by reaching participants in the community at large and developed viable working relationships with staff. The staff, in this case, is young adults between 20-38. At this point in time the relationship between the staff, the sponsoring agency and the youth board is again being refined to determine specific areas of responsibility.

COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY RELATIONS HARD DATA

I.	TOTAL TRAINEES ON STIPEND BOARD AND IN-SCHOOL	82
II.	SEX	65 Male 17 Female
III.	AVERAGE AGE	18
IV.	MARITAL STATUS	77 Single 5 Married
	CHILDREN	76 No 6 Yes
V.	SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS	4% above federal poverty level 96% below federal poverty level
VI.	ETHNIC BACKGROUND	70 Black 12 White
VII.	EDUCATION	52 Still in High School 13 Drop outs from High School 17 Have High School Diploma
VIII.	PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE	Types of Jobs Gardener, Clean-Up, Dishwasher, Custodian, Window washer, Bag-boy, Porter, Cashier (1).
		Highest Salaries $2.05 per hour
		Lowest Salaries $1.25 per hour, average

V. COLONIAS DEL VALLE, SAN JUAN, TEXAS

The staff of the Colonias project consists entirely of local Mexican-American youth devoted to developing a series of programs for the community as a whole. In a sense, the Colonias represents youth leadership rather than youth involvement. The youth have been engaged in developing programs whose value is community-wide, rather than focused specifically on the interests or participation of youth. Youth fulfillment and self realization is projected in this project as stemming from generic rather than particularistic, youth-centered activity. Problems in facilitating these objectives were evidenced in the meager direction provided the youngsters in how to go about developing these community-wide programs. Apart from this shortcoming, youth contacted many families through a health research survey, worked in a cooperative food program, and helped with welfare, legal, health and other problems. More than this, they have come to understand and have developed a deep committment to working to solve the widespread problems which beset the southwestern Mexican-American community.

When the original grant for a survey was awarded, there was no formal youth structure that existed, merely the identification of youth leadership as indicated above. The formation of a formal youth board under the legal auspice of the community organization is just now in the beginning stages. All staff members of the program are youth, aged 25 and under, and they are actively involved in the business of the sponsoring organization.

COLONIAS DEL VALLE HARD DATA

I.	TOTAL PARTICIPANTS HIRED		23
II.	SEX		Unknown
III.	AGE	Range 16-25	Average 20.5
IV.	MARITAL STATUS		Unknown
V.	SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS		78% less than $3,000 per year
VI.	ETHNIC BACKGROUND		100% Mexican-American
VII.	EDUCATION		3 College Courses 6 High School Drop outs 14 In School
VIII.	PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE		Farm Laborer

VI. 12TH AND OXFORD CORPORATION, PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

The Board of Directors of the 12th and Oxford Corporation is made up of 12 local youth, age 20-24, who meet weekly, and is advised by a group of older community adults. The youth, board, and staff set policy, manage,and control the corporation. Board and staff members are indigenous to the project target area and are closely identified with the program. While conventional objectivity and impartiality are considered the sine qua non of board functioning, this is clearly not the case with 12th and Oxford, nor should it be. The Board provides the major vehicle for youth involvement in all aspects of program development and operation. Another unique substantive opportunity for youth involvement grew out of the relationship which the project developed with Temple University. Apart from opening educational opportunities to neighborhood youngsters, members of the 12th and Oxford Corporation serve as lecturers in a special workshop organized by the University. The opportunity local ghetto youth had to address the community at large via the university represents a distinctive and important bridge between these youngsters and the city as a whole. The neighborhood within which this project is located has been the scene of persistant gang conflict over the years.

Members of 12th and Oxford's Board worked informally with city officials to attempt to alleviate these conflicts. Other than theses two activities mentioned above, there is no formal relationship between board members and other community committees.

12TH AND OXFORD HARD DATA

I.	PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS (6/30/70)		76
II.	SEX		100% Male
III.	AGE	Range 12-22 Range 20-24	Average 17 Participant Average 22 Board
IV.	MARITAL STATUS		72 Single 4 Married
V.	SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS		Poverty level 70% on Welfare
VI.	ETHNIC BACKGROUND		100% Black
VII.	EDUCATION		24 High School Drop outs Remaining - uncertain

VII HARTRANFT MULTI-PURPOSE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, PHILADELPHIA., PA.

This program, sponsored by the School District of Philadelphia and delegated to Hartranft Community Corporation, an adult neighborhood corporation, is under the direct responsibility of a Youth Council formed with the development of the youth program. The youth council is composed of approximately thirty members of local youth gangs. These representatives are chosen by each group affiliated with the program. The council meets every two weeks and technically has responsibility for policy and administration of the program. However, the adult board which has designated a committee of four adults to oversee the decisions of the youth board has been reluctant to allow the youth board any of the prerogatives which it has agreed to. While the structure currently exists to allow for appropriate youth involvement, the struggle around making this a reality for the youth continues. At the time of the last election for the adult board, the youth took an active interest, ran several of their members for seats on the council, and succeeded in winning four of them.

HARTRANFT COMMUNITY CORPORATION HARD DATA

I.	NUMBER OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS	2000
II.	AGE Range 15-28	
III.	SEX	Both Male and Female
IV.	LENGTH OF ASSOCIATION WITH THE PROGRAM	2-1/2 years average
V.	SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS	Low Economic bracket
VI.	ETHNIC BACKGROUND	Black and Puerto Rican
VII.	SCHOOL ATTENDANCE	High percentage of drop outs
VIII.	PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE	12 out of 100 employed 86% unemployed
IX.	SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME	Welfare and Public Assistance
X.	NATURE OF PROGRAM PARTICIPATION	See Quarterly Report

VIII. NEW COMMUNICATORS, INC., LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

Because of the nature of the program, the board of New Communicators was made up primarily of persons with skills or contact in the film industry. Youth trainees were represented on the board and the program plan called for a trainee cooperative. However, the responsibility of the youth representatives on the board of this program was continuously questioned by adult members and this issue was never really resolved. The intervention of the funding agency was necessary in order to guarantee the youth representative voting rights on the board. This happened late in the program year.

In summary, though youth were very "involved" in struggling with the conflict over adult domination, this program did not represent formal recognition by the sponsoring organization of the concept of youth involvement.

NEW COMMUNICATORS, INC. HARD DATA

I.	TOTAL TRAINEES		17
II.	AGE	Range 19-33	Average 23
III.	SEX		15 Male 2 Female
IV.	MARITAL STATUS		12 Single 5 Married
V.	SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS		13 At or below poverty level, including 1 on Welfare.
VI.	ETHNIC BACKGROUND		9 Black 7 Mexican-American 1 White
VII.	EDUCATION		5 Didn't complete High School 11 Completed High School and either had training or some higher education courses. 1 College Degree

VIII. Previous work experience varied from laborer, waitress, mailman, unemployed. Only 1 had full-time employment prior to program.

IX. NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE COMMUNICATIONS PROJECT, RICHMOND, CALIF.

The Neighborhood House project was generated in the youth program existing in the center. Several groups of youngsters participated in establishing a Youth Advisory Board which was assigned responsibility for program policy and was represented on the Neighborhood House Board. Substantial youth involvement took place through youth serving as staff and media personnel, and by the interaction of these youngsters with community youth and adults who comprised their audiences. Youngsters attracted to the program wanted to participate directly in its activities. They were reluctant to get involved in such instrumental activities as the council, board or other managerial-administrative roles. This lack of interest was exacerbated by the settlement's strong executive director, who took her prerogatives of leadership and policy making seriously. These factors contributed to a situation where the apparatus for youth involvement, though present, was largely inoperable. This problem grew worse as board and youth staff drifted further apart and the vacuum left was filled by the administration of the sponsoring agency. As program developed and youth participants became more identified with the program, a working agreement was developed between the youth board and the adult board. By the end of the contract period,a functioning board of eleven youth and six adults guided the decision making of the project.

This program truly represents the dynamics of making the concept of youth involvement a functioning reality.

NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE COMMUNICATIONS PROJECT HARD DATA

I.	TOTAL PARTICIPANTS AND STAFF	293
II.	SEX	55% Male 47% Female
III.	AGE	Average 22
IV.	MARITAL STATUS	Unknown
V.	SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS	90% within federal poverty criteria
VI.	ETHNIC BACKGROUND	100% Black
VII.	EDUCATION	Unknown
VIII.	PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE	Unknown

X. THE REAL GREAT SOCIETY, NEW YORK, NEW YORK

The Real Great Society is unique as a true example of a youth conceived, developed and administered program. The organization as a corporation is composed of ghetto youth. In the case of RGS there is no aspect of the operation of the project which is not in the hands of youth. In existence for several years prior to OEO funding, the proposal submitted to OEO was developed by the youth. Board and staff are youth; program, budget, hiring et. al. are done by youth. In short, the program is a truly indigenous youth project whose every activity reflects youth involvement.

RGS struggled through some sharp problems of interpersonal relationships and roles. The youngsters demonstrated a willingness to accept adult assistance with these problems and managed to continue without the bitter divisive battles and sweeping changes of personnel which so often characterizes this sort of organizational conflict. The youngsters survived a series of economic and political crises which might very well have destroyed the project and it is not unreasonable to assert that the substantive control of program by the youth themselves contributed immeasurably to this survival.

REAL GREAT SOCIETY HARD DATA

I.	TOTAL STAFF Information on staff only since nature of program is economic development		8
II.	SEX		7 Male 1 Female
III.	AGE	Range 20-33	Average 26
IV.	MARITAL STATUS		Unknown
V.	SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS		All low income, ghetto residents
VI.	ETHNIC BACKGROUND		7 Puerto Rican 1 Chinese
VII.	EDUCATION		1 GED 1 Drop out from High School 1 High School and some College 3 High School and training 2 Unknown
VIII.	PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE		Salesclerk, Bookkeeper, Sales Manager, Manager of Clothing Store, Designer, Department Store.

XI. NATIONAL RECREATION AND PARKS ASSOCIATION: MARTIN LUTHER KING XII. CENTER, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND: LINCOLN CENTER, CINCINNATI, OHIO: XIII.AND CARVER COMMUNITY PARK AND RECREATION BOARD, YUMA, ARIZONA.

The youth involvement components of the three NRPA projects were introduced as a consequence of actions by OEO staff and by program consultants available under the technical assistance grants. Such devices as youth councils, youth representation on boards and youth in staff assignments were employed by the Martin Luther King Center. The Youth Council provided a vehicle for effective participation, even to the lending of funds earned through conducting public programs, to the MLK board. Youth staff members were also enthusiastic, effective and hard working,providing a core of leadership and esprit de corps to the entire project.

Board participation on the other hand was sporadic and largely ineffectual, reflecting more adult intransigence than youthful inabilities.

At the outset, the Lincoln Center project was unable to effectively integrate local youngsters in the governance of the project. Despite the unavailability of formal channels for involvement, youngsters, again,by their enthusiasm and commitment as participants in program,provided a catalytic force which pushed the project forward. As the project developed, more influence was exercised on the project by youth through their increased participation on the project board, the majority of

which were under the age of twenty-four. Using creative programming to gain support and recognition, youth assumed a number of leadership positions on the board--the secretary-treasurer is 21, the president 23. Some youth active in the project board have moved on to participate in Model Cities and other programs serving the West End Community.

The Carver project projected a Youth Advisory Council of at least one young adult staff member and two seats on the adult board. Throughout the bulk of the project's experience, intrusive battles within the board and persistent difficulty in getting the program off the ground effectively precluded youth involvement. After a young staff member was hired, the youth council was organized and the presence of the youngsters within the project appeared highly saluatory. At this point, the board seemed to have resolved a number of its major difficulties and the prospect of youth involvement in its deliberations has once again become viable. In this program,the local director of recreation has supported the program consultant's efforts to move the issue of youth participation,and this has unquestionably facilitated the progress noted.

* MARTIN LUTHER KING CENTER HARD DATA

I.	NUMBER OF REGULAR PARTICIPANTS		725
II.	AGE	Range 2-85	56% (400) High School Students 25% (175) Young Adults 21% (150) Adults
III.	SEX		75% Male 26% Female
IV.	ETHNIC BACKGROUND		100% Black
V.	EMPLOYMENT		Males in Construction
VI.	INCOME		60% of Families on Public Welfare Average Income $4,800 per year
VII.	MARITAL STATUS		Unknown Program participation had a slight drop
VIII.	SCHOOL ATTENDANCE		95% of 400 youth in school.

* Note: No hard data was available from two (2) of the three (3) NRPA programs, namely, Cincinnati and Yuma.

SUMMARY: YOUTH INVOLVEMENT EXPERIENCES

Of the twelve (12) programs described above, seven (7) have formal structures providing youth involvement in decision making within all aspects of the program functioning. The remaining five (5) sites (which includes the three (3) programs of the NRPA grant) never achieved any formal structure directed towards the testing of youth involvement concepts.

Of the seven (7) that have formal structures, four (4) youth boards are not incorporated, but act in an advisory capacity to a sponsoring adult organization. These four (4) programs are Hartranft, Commission on Community Relations, The Youth Civic Center, and Neighborhood House Communications Project. The remaining three (3), The Real Great Society, 12th and Oxford, and Dayton Youth Patrol,are incorporated organizations receiving direct funding from OEO. Of these three (3), the board membership of two, namely, The Real Great Society and 12th and Oxford, are entirely composed of youth. The Board membership of the Dayton Youth Patrol is evenly distributed between youth and adults (approximately 50%/50%).

For those four (4) programs where youth Boards exist in an advisory capacity to a sponsoring adult organization, the predominant issue of the program year was the development of a clear understanding of the responsibilities of each Board and the

accountability of each to the other. This situation is clearly exemplified by the experience of the Neighborhood House youth program of Richmond, California. (Please refer to our third quarterly report.)

For the two (2) programs where the Boards are entirely made up of youth representing youth decision making in its purest form, their predominant difficulty was the failure of adult institutions to actively respond to the concept of youth involvement.

Based on these experiences, it is our recommendation that the concept of youth involvement should continue to be tested but that a new structure should be developed which will actively encourage youth involvement and, in addition, produce a creative partnership between youth and responsive adults. Further elaboration on this concept will be provided in Section IV of this report.

The summary of hard data which follows offers a collective picture of the characteristics of youth involved in each of these programs.

SUMMARY: HARD DATA

In the following summary of hard data we have separated the information of three programs (The Commission on Community Relations, The Dayton Youth Patrol, and The New Communicators, Inc.) from the summary of the remaining seven (7). This is done because the three mentioned above are training programs whose goals and effectiveness are measured differently from other types of social action programs which produced data. However, as noted,a complete report on hard data for each program is included in the Analysis Section of this report.

TRAINING PROGRAMS

The Commission on Community Relations

The Dayton Youth Patrol

The New Communicators, Inc.

I.	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	Average 73 (Total 219)
II.	SEX	65% Male 35% Female
III.	AGE	Average 21
IV.	SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS	93% Below federal poverty level 7% Above federal poverty level
V.	ETHNIC BACKGROUND	90% Black 7% White 3% Mexican-American

SOCIAL CHANGE PROGRAMS

NRPA (The Martin Luther King Center)

12th and Oxford

Hartranft

Colonias Del Valle

Neighborhood House Communications Project

The Real Great Society

The Youth Civic Center

I.	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	Average 454
II.	SEX	74% Male * 26% Female
III.	AGE	Average 21 **
IV.	SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS	71% Below federal poverty level or on Welfare *
V.	ETHNIC BACKGROUND	100% Black for four (4) programs. 100% Mexican-American for one (1). 88% Puerto-Rican, 12% Other for one (1) program. 88% Black, 12% Puerto Rican for one (1) program.
VI.	EDUCATION	23% High School Drop Outs*** 67% High School and Additional Training (2 had college degrees).
VII.	PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE	Varied from farm laborer to custodian.

---

* As reported in five(5) programs.
** As reported in six (6) programs.
*** As reported in three (3) programs.

BOARDS AND ADULT-YOUTH RELATIONSHIPS

Policy making, like self-evaluation, is an integral part of any program which purports to substantially involve program participants. Policy making is of course a complex procedure in that it involves not only the accountability of the program to those who use it, but also accountability to the larger community in which it is located and the sponsoring agencies which fund it. In addition, the policy-making body, the board of directors, is, in fact, the entity which is legally responsible for the actions of the project and thus is the official face and spokesman for it. All these factors combine to influence the composition and operation of the project boards. Also, in a number of cases, policy-making or advisory bodies of municipal departments or local sponsoring or affiliated agencies existed which claimed part or all jurisdiction over the conduct of the local youth program. Thus, in a good many instances, the project board becomes the arena within which a substantial portion of formal youth-adult relationships get worked out.

Because the various projects under contract shared, either as a matter of obligation or conviction, a commitment to youth involvement, there was in every case at least a pro forma arrangement whereby youth were to participate in the governance of the project. By the arrangements made, a certain quota of seats on the local board were set aside for youth representatives. In most instances, these representatives were chosen directly by

the project's youth constituency; in several instances, however, they were selected by staff or the Board as a whole. Setting aside three to six seats for youth, generally between ten and twenty percent of the total, proved ineffective as a device to engage youngsters in project policy making. Board meetings tended to be highly formal. They were held at a time and place convenient to their adult majority and agendas were determined without the participation of youth. Thus, youth members felt the style of the Board was uncongenial. In addition, since the aforementioned arrangement left youth with no power to affect policy decisions, they viewed participation as a meaningless and somewhat trying ritual. Such arrangements did not work.

Illustrated by the above is the fact that meaningful representation cannot be granted by the adults to the youth as a matter of sufference or noblesse. When this occurs youth representatives serve the adult board's purpose. Such purpose, i.e. to provide information or advice, may either be legitimate or false; legitimate when youth's counsel is heeded or seriously considered, false when youth serve as a facade to give the illusion of involvement where none exists. In either case, however, such purpose is not participation in the policy-making function of the board. Participation that has meaning can take place only when the youth are a significant group, answerable to their own and

with sufficient power so that they can be neither implicitly nor explicitly ignored. The experience of the various projects emphatically supports these generalizations, both in the affirmative and the negative. The earlier reports indicate that, in every case, pro forma representation just doesn't work. In those instances where youth viability and potency were evident, i.e. Baltimore and Youth Civic Center, shared responsibility for policy making was possible and effective.

An interesting issue is presented by the consideration of youth-adult cooperation in policy making. To what extent should the agency's commitment be to the literal involvement of young persons as opposed to the enactment of policies which will meet their needs. If, after all, as has so often been the case, there are no substantive differences between youth and adults why should it matter who makes the decision. Often adult surrogates for youth interests are more forceful, more effective, than the youth themselves could ever be. These observations regarding surrogate advocacy on behalf of youngsters apply equally to staff as well as to board. A case in point is the Dayton Youth Patrol, whose adult leadership embodied the essence of youth vested interest and whose effectiveness with larger municipal, state and federal systems brought these interests to life through the Patrol. Without adult dominance, at least at its genesis, this program would never have come to be. Similar circumstances obtained in most of the other projects under contract.

In keeping with the position taken in the first part of this section, it is the view of these consultants that while adults can, should, and will often act independently on behalf of a youthful constituency, such action must be limited. The absence of substantive difference is a matter of momentary circumstance and no program purporting to serve youth in the ways outlined in the OEO guidelines can do so without them, on their behalf. The experience of the projects being serviced supports this contention; lack of operational viability quickly became an issue when youth participation was limited to pro forma tokenism, i.e. Neighborhood House, Youth Civic Center.

The model of an autonomous youth board, made up of and controlled by youth, is somewhat rare. It can be found most unambiguously in the experience of RGS and in the Youth Civic Center. Youth boards which are autonomous, independent and self-controlled do not eschew adult participation or involvement. In fact, substantive independence includes the freedom to make alliances and common cause with others (adults in this case) and to utilize resources which they may have,i.e. expertise, community contacts, etc. Both RGS and the Youth Civic Center were able to utilize adult resources extensively because they were secure in their independence. Such utilization was not felt as impinging on the project; quite the contrary, it was seen as facilitating the project's work.

Board training is an activity about which a great deal is said and very little done. For if the truth is to be known, boards are generally seen as unnecessary complications in the lives of the few staff or community influential elites who usually control program. From this view it is preferred that boards be acquiescent and passive so that they can be relied upon to come up with decisions which the program dominants consider appropriate. Thus,board training when it takes place is an effort to socialize board members to the values of the professionals or the ideology of the community people who dominate the agency or project.

As viewed by the monitoring-technical assistance staff, however, board training was an instrument for providing inexperienced local residents with the skills by which they could democratically run their own organization. It was, in addition, the vehicle by which self-evaluation, youth involvement and other substantive elements in the project could be brought into the local community and vested there. Finally, board training was seen as providing the insights and skills by which various community groups could function harmoniously: youth, adults, sponsors, other local institutions, et al.

Because the monitoring staff viewed the board as a central instrument of project success rather than as an impediment, it sought to help create effective boards through training. An active informed participating board can be a strong impediment

to oligarchy; it therefore is central to projects such as these , whose raison d'etre is participation and involvement. Work with the Martin Luther King Center best illustrates the training process we have in mind,though it is reflected in the other two NRPA projects as well.

ADMINISTRATION

Specific recommendations regarding the most troublesome administrative aspects of project life are made in Section IV of this report. Apart from them, we should like to make several observations regarding the administration of the programs conducted by the projects. Our comments are relative; that is they are in keeping with the vaudeville comic who when asked, "How's your wife?" answered, "Compared to what?" We are impatient with the popular sweeping generalizations so often made regarding administrative sloppiness and poor management of community-based programs. Compared to what ? The military,which gives itself medals for fictitious heroism? The phone company ? The airlines ? Any federal, state,or municipal agency ? The calamities heaped on community-based programs reflect bias and politics that are not based on substance. They are plagued with problems which they are sometimes unable to handle efficaciously. They also frequently find themselves in positions for which they are unprepared and have no protocol on which to rely. Basically, however, their efforts go to program viability and their false starts and errors rarely reflect corruption or deceit. Often, in fact, they are faulted for doing the very things they've been mandated to do: involve locals, institute changes, redress grievances,and provide experience from which youngsters and adults will draw a sense of independence and self-sufficiency. Since such achievements

can rarely be attacked directly, vested institutional forces, smarting under their own culpability, raise the ever present spectre of administrative mismanagement.

LEADERSHIP

Implicit in this report is an affirmation of the concept of youth involvement expressed by the experience of youth programs serviced during the contract year. Such shortcomings as were suffered by all the projects are not attributable to any fallacy in this basic assumption regarding the management of their own affairs by local residents. The essential factor which supports this claim is the substantive and qualitative resource represented by the local youth themselves. This resource has been evidenced in every project under contract. Not by single outstanding charismatic leaders alone, but by the ability of rank and file youth to assume responsibility. Such leadership is endemic; as described in the reports, it appears in the ghettos of New York City and Philadelphia, in Midwest Urban centers such as Columbus and Dayton, in small rural communities such as The Dalles and San Juan, Texas. To have such a resource and to deny or harass it, is to fly in the face of history. To own such a resource, to embrace it and give it its head, is the route by which the storms of current social change can be weathered. Each of the youth projects herein described, have, to some extent, offered youth the opportunity to do their own thing. The experience has been submitted.

SELF-EVALUATION DESIGN AND TRAINING

As indicated earlier, contact was made with some programs early during the contract period and, in other cases, contact did not occur until October or November, 1969. By November of 1969, it was clear that each program was overwhelmed with monumental problems which, in most cases,were related to their acquiring refunding, special supplements, extentions, problems with Boards of Directors, administration and a host of other issues. It was also evident that every program was suffering from the severe limitations of one-year funding and the vast amount of internal problems such funding mechanisms create.

After completing contact with each program, we reviewed the nature and quality of services being provided by our consultants.

It was obvious that the primary concern of most programs was that of determining how such programs would survive three (3) to six (6) months following the date of our visit. Some had funds but were concerned about receiving an extension from OEO; others had limited funds but were concerned about refunding. Almost every program had severe problems in receiving direction from their res-

pective Boards of Directors in terms of supporting and developing true mechanisms for youth involvement. Many had administrative problems and sought technical assistance in this area. It should also be noted that at this time ten (10) of the fourteen (14) youth programs covered were due to expire within six months or less.

Although each project director was clearly informed by the contractor and OEO of the nature and usefulness of developing a formal self-evaluation design and process, in almost every case the problems of program survival overwhelmed undertaking such a task. Each program leaned very heavily upon our consultants for technical assistance in generalized areas which were directed towards the urgency of today's problems.

The formal process of self-evaluation, on the surface, appeared time consuming, unproductive and did not have an immediate pay-off for program survival. This set of circumstances led us to reevaluate how the concept of self-evaluation could be structured such that it became functional to each youth program rather than just another grant requirement which burdens the fulfillment of program objectives.

As indicated earlier, the essence of self-evaluation is that of undertaking self-investigation, self-direction and a willingness to accurately report what one experiences. The specific design used in this process is unimportant. However, in carrying out such procedures, one must create an environment in which the fear of failure is diminished and the quest for knowledge given the highest possible priority. This process can take place only by mutual agreement between the funding agency and the grantee.

As suggested above, when survival becomes the most important problem of the movement, "bureaucratic requirements" such as self-evaluation are hardly relevant to the grantee. Therefore, in order to make the services of the contract useful, it was necessary to address the most pressing problems first in order to later proceed into a process of self-evaluation.

In most cases, the problems of survival persisted throughout the program year.

Examples of the problems and issues experienced by specific youth programs covered by the Youth Monitoring and Self-Evaluation contract may be found in Appendix "D". This document represents a summary of our staff conference held in New York on January 21 and 22 of 1970. This conference was designed to assess the status of each youth program covered by contractual agreement and to project future consultation activities.

The problems faced by all programs during this period can be separated into five(5) distinct categories:

I. Programs terminated by OEO during the contract period.

II. Programs facing termination within thirty(30) days of our conference.

III. Programs which had severe problems with their respective Boards of Directors or other administrative problems.

IV. Programs which were in the throes of attempting to develop a new proposal for refunding.

V. And, programs ready for the self-evaluation process--meaning that although such programs may have been beset by other problems, there remained some capability to engage in a systematic process of self-evaluation.

Categories

I.....	1.	Brockton, Mass.
	2.	Los Angeles, California
II.....	1.	Syracuse, N.Y.
	2.	Hartranft, Phila., Pa.
	3.	San Francisco, Calif.
III.....	1.	Yuma, Arizona
	2.	Baltimore, Md.
	3.	Richmond, California
	4.	Cincinnati, Ohio
IV.	1.	Dalles, Oregon
	2.	Columbus, Ohio
V.....	1.	New York, N.Y.
	2.	Tampa, Florida
	3.	12th and Oxford, Phila., Pa.
	4.	Dayton, Ohio

It should be noted that the categorical designations offered above are not mutually exclusive and that considerable overlapping exists in determining the extent to which various programs were not capable of engaging in a formal process of self-evaluation. For example, almost every program had considerable problems in one form or another of administration and in gaining direction from their respective Board of Directors. The intensity of these problems varied from program to program. Thus, if the activity of the Board and Program administration was not seen as a central issue at the time of our intervention, it was not classified in the above chart.

SELF-EVALUATION PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

The program of self-evaluation requires that the grantee possess a fair degree of organizational clarity, the involvement of participants in program development activities and the assurance of relative freedom from pressing day-to-day crisis. Unfortunately, most of the projects under contract did not contain these requisite circumstances, particularly at their inception. Therefore, the degree to which it was possible for self-evaluation to be a palpable force in the life of these programs was somewhat circumscribed.

Program consultants recognized that their primary technical assistance task was directed towards basic organization building. They utilized the components of self-evaluation to achieve this end. Thus, assistance emphasized participation by as broad an aggregation as possible in the building of viable organizational structures and the articulation of reaffirmation of the program's objectives. The bulk of assistance offered went to dealing with the innumerable crises precipitated by unanticipated occurrences, by the uncertainties created by funding problems, and the interaction of the project with various community constituencies.

In the case of the NRPA projects, local participation actually began with the arrival of our consultants. The prior reports illustrate the ways in which technical assistance was utilized to build these entities. We believe that the precedents set in the

past year provided these groups with experience in, and a commitment to, the self-evaluation process. It is to be hoped that such precedents will continue without continued outside assistance. Though, in candor, we are forced to say that in these three programs, as well as in several others (i.e. Neighborhood House and The Commission on Community Relations), it is not unlikely that more autocratic procedures will takeover in the absence of consultants committed to self-evaluation.

It is not surprising to find that it is in the long-lived projects, such as R.G.S. and the Youth Civic Center, that the self-evaluation process operated at its most effective and comprehensive level. Nor is it presumptuous to suggest that in such projects as these it is most unlikely that there will be a regression to a less democratic form of operation. Despite the strengths of these programs, however, it is notable that even here the process was substantially aided by the technical assistance provided by the consultant. In other programs, such as Neighborhood House and Mid-Columbia Youth for Progress, Inc., the self-evaluation process was limited by the reluctance of numbers of participants to engage in non-expressive activities (that is, more managerial activities, unrelated to program). Youngsters were in the main interested in those activities from which they could derive direct satisfaction, rather than in appraisal and decision-making. These latter efforts, as we so well know, are often highly frustrating because the benefits are remote and future delibera - tion requires the kind of compromise and flexibility which can

effectively bleed the excitement and magic out of the most attractive program. That some groups found such instrumental activity as self-evaluation exciting and rewarding was a function of their identification and involvement in the project. It was not a reflection of any intrinsic excitement stemming from the activity itself. We would speculate,therefore, that self-evaluation can succeed only when it is meaningful, when issues are real and the decisions made implemented. This would suggest that the experience of Neighborhood House and Mid-Columbia might have been different had there been a willingness on the part of the Settlement Board in the first case, and the local CAP in the second, to allow the youth to make substantive decisions.

The notion that the evaluation process is most fruitfully fulfilled by the recipients of service is both simple and profound. It reflects the fact that those who use programs have the greatest stake in their constancy and integrity and that as participants they have the most comprehensive and least ambiguous view of the program itself. Such a view does not suggest, nor does it imply, that participants necessarily have the requisite technical skills and resources to conduct a self-evaluation process. It is believed that such skills can be initially attained from outside resources and ultimately incorporated into the repertory of skills of project participants and personnel. Unfortunately, it is difficult to acquire the expertise needed to conduct evaluative activity. Local resources, universities, or private consultant firms, are

generally loath to put their skills into the hands of project persons. Such experts generally hold the view that the entire process must be controlled and conducted by themselves. Thus, while they would be perfectly willing, even anxious, to accept responsibility for all aspects of the evaluative process, they are quite reluctant to help the project to do it themselves. Reflecting this state of affairs, many projects had great difficulty obtaining the kind of ongoing assistance that would enable them to carry out self-evaluation. Several notable exceptions were Youth Civic Center and 12th and Oxford, Inc. who were fortunate to find at Ohio State and Temple Universities exactly the kind of persons who would facilitate the groups conducting their own appraisal process.

A word needs to be said regarding the matter of objectivity. Self-evaluation is not a technique of formal inquiry conducted along norms of scientific method to ascertain knowledge or discover new Truths. It is,rather, a device for involvement and accountability which keeps a complex social endeavor on course. Objectivity, then,in rigorous social science research, is more a matter of recognizing and allowing (to the extent that one is able) for bias, rather than the absence of bias. Therefore, the argument that self-evaluation isn't objective is moot. At best, one could suggest that the biases of another party should be substituted for the biases of the project itself. And this argument, of course, is answerable by the earlier assertion regarding the primary commitment to the project's program and

of its participants. This commitment is the factor which makes the bias of the project personnel least likely to be destructive or diversionary.

As indicated earlier, almost all youth were struggling with severe problems of survival and thus the development of formal self-evaluation designs was an impossibility. We also suggested earlier that each program was reevaluated and the nature of our specific task clarified. Thus, with the concurrence of OEO, in January of 1970, our basic strategy changed from attempting to develop formal self-evaluation designs to that of assisting various programs with more rudimentary problems through an informal process of self-investigation. Appendix "D" described the specific issues discussed in January of 1970. The following represents the nature of the struggle experienced by each youth and the consultation provided by contract agreement:

PROGRAM	PROGRAM PROBLEM	MAJOR SELF-EVALUATION CONSULTATION ACTIVITY
	EASTERN	
1. Martin Luther King Recreation Center, Baltimore, Md.	1. Difficulty in operationalizing programs. 2. Severe Problems with Board. 3. Scarce monetary resources--Low level funding.	1. Assisted with development of self administered Board Training Programs. 2. Assisted with developing group sessions (Board of Directors and Staff) directed toward self investigation. 3. Assisted in planning program operations and finding new funding sources.
2. 12th And Oxford Corp. Phila.,Pa.	1. Severe community problems such as "gang wars" and inter-organizational conflicts. 2. Access difficulty.	1. Provided assistance in stemming gang conflicts. Held joint meetings with city officials and others. 2. Held group sessions directed towards program evaluation. 3. Program received considerable supportive services from personnel at Temple University (Miss Betty Schantz).
3. Hartranft Multi-Purpose Youth Development Project. Phila., Pa.	1. Severe community problems ("gang wars") inter- organization conflict. 2. Staff problems in high staff turnover and some problems with narcotics addiction. 3. Program implementations impeded by nature of funding.	1. Provided considerable assistance in resolving inter-organizational difficulties. 2. Assisted in stemming gang conflicts. 3. Assisted with staff problems.

4.	Real Great Society New York, N.Y.	1. Severe staff problems. 2. Internal fiscal management problems resulting from previous year's grant to "University of the Streets." 3. Problems with work programs	1. Provided self-evaluative T-Group sessions in order to resolve staff problems. 2. Provided Technical assistance in Fiscal Management and in fulfilling OEO guidelines regarding work programs.
5.	Commission on Human Relations Youth Board	1. Problems with The Local sponsoring Community Action Agency. 2. Problems in developing program direction and making program decision. 3. Youth Board.	1. Received considerable assistance from outside consultant, Mr.William Blount in addition to our consultant in developing self-evaluation procedures. This resulted in production of considerable hard data and the development of self-evaluation strategies. Result of this effort is described in third quarterly report. 2. Assisted in resolving problems with local CAA.
6.	Projection '70 Syracuse, N.Y.	1. Program suffered from severe gaps in refunding by OEO; caused loss of staff and in effect terminated program. 2. Project Director withdrew request for refunding.	1. Initial attempt made to assist in the development of new programs; however, such an attempt would result in beginning all over again. Undertaking such a venture was not feasible.
		MIDWESTERN	
7.	Youth Civic Center Columbus, Ohio	1. Early major concern was that of developing new program proposal to be submitted for refunding; gap in refunding. 2. Problems with the Adult Board of Directors and some administrative problems.	1. Assistance provided in program development. 2. Assistance provided in dealing with Adult Board and administration. 3. Evaluation and self-evaluation services provided jointly with Mr. Jack Kasmond of Ohio State University. Note: The operational procedures of this program built self-evaluation into almost every aspect of the program. (that is, self-government).

8. Lincoln Center (NRPA) Cincinnati, Ohio	1. Severe problems with Board of Directors. Required further development in order to provide program direction. 2. Unclarity regarding nature and purpose of grant. 3. Desire to develop and implement wide range of various program activities. 4. Low level of funding thus limiting program development activities.	1. Provided generalized consultation related to refunding; problem with Board of Directors and program development. 2. Major effort made to clarify nature and purpose of grant in addition to assisting with program implementation. 3. Formal self-evaluation procedures not appropriate.
9. Dayton Youth Patrol Dayton, Ohio	1. Although capability for formal self-evaluation process, severe staff problems created immobility in this area. Program continued to function. However, did not meet maximum potential; difficulty with the implementation of various program components.	1. Major assistance directed towards resolution of staff problems. 2. Assistance provided in attempting to develop systematic collection of vast amount of hard data. 3. Assistance provided in program development and implementation.
	WESTERN	
10. Neighborhood House Richmond, Calif.	1. Severe problems with Board of Directors and in receiving administrative and flexible fiscal support. 2. Required greater clarity with implementation of Youth Involvement. 3. Considerable problems with staff and program leadership.	1. Consultant provided formal Board training services with the aid of Mr. G. Roemer; attempted to clarify work program, relationship of Board to youth, staff problems, fiscal and administrative arrangements and OEO guidelines.

11. Mid-Columbia Youth for Progress Dalles, Oregon.	1. Struggle with completing proposal resulting from planning period (short term initial grant for planning purposes). 2. Major concern program development and refunding. 3. Serious problems with acquiring community support of program and in accepting concept of youth involvement.	1. Assistance provided in program development, in clarifying OEO guidelines and other grant requirements. 2. Assistance provided in attempting to help community institutions and individuals understand nature of grant and concept of youth involvement.
12. Colonias Del Valle Work-Study Research Project. San Juan, Texas	1. Short-term planning grant. 2. Major concern program development and refunding. 3. Problems with nature of "migrant" program participants.	1. Provided consultation related to program development and in sensitizing central project staff to OEO requirements.
13. Carver Community Parks and Recreation Center. (NRPA) Yuma, Arizona.	1. Low level of funding which limited program development activities. 2. General unclarity regarding nature and purpose of grant 3. Severe lack of program leadership. 4. Ineffective Board structure and Board functioning. 5. No real community constituency or support. 6. Program ill-defined and vague.	1. Attempted to provide assistance in sharpening program direction. 2. Assisted with staff recruitment and staff development. 3. Provide program development consultation. 4. Clarified nature and purpose of grant and grant requirements. 5. Generally assisted with all aspects of program functioning. 6. Self-evaluation procedures not appropriate.

14. New Communicators, Inc. Los Angeles, California	1. Terminated early during contract period. 2. Severe staff conflict led to destruction of program. 3. Although considerable interest evident by other community institutions such as UCLA and others, program was terminated.	1. Provided general consultation services directed towards reducing internal conflict among program staff. 2. Assisted in establishing a dialogue between OEO and grantee regarding project issues. 3. Undertook follow-up study to determine disposition of trainees who completed training program.

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

As described in the materials included in earlier quarterly reports, the programs of the various projects under contract encompassed a broad range of activities. Successful programs seem to have varied with local circumstances. The experience of the projects does not indicate any particular activity or set of activities as particularly effective. Generally, when the project as a whole was functioning well, that is, when participants were actively involved, staff were competent and dedicated, funds were available, and no crises were pressing, programs flourished.

The Communications Media: Several of the projects, most notably New Communicators Inc., Neighborhood House and 12th and Oxford, were based on the arts as related to films, video tape and journalism. The objectives of these programs generally included the use of the media to give information to the community at large and for training youth in media skills.

The 12th and Oxford motion picture, The Jungle, is perhaps the most striking example of a group's getting its message across creatively, artistically and effectively. As noted in earlier reports, this film was widely shown as a dramatic illustration of the life of urban ghetto youth. A program which produces a film such as this has an impact which goes much beyond the project and the target community. Widely circulated, shown before national groups and federal agencies, The Jungle brought its

message, which was in effect the message of the R&D unit of OEO, to a variety of populations. The experience of New Communicators best illustrates the use of the media to train youth for commercial employment in the field. The bulk of the trainees of this project were able to find employment in the industry as a consequence both of their technical training and of the connections to industry held by various members of the project's board. This suggests that skills, at least in this field, are not sufficient. Skills achieved through such experience are, of course, of value in and of themselves in that they provide creative channels for self expression.

Such expression is a most positive device for enabling communities to express and redress grievances. The sharper the content of the work, the greater the personal pay-off to the program participants. In light of this, it was unfortunate that some in the local community and in the sponsoring agency were fearful of controversial material and discouraged groups from areas where conflict might be induced. This, for example, was the case with Neighborhood House, particularly with regard to the community Newsletter. At times like these, when so many are forced to seek the expression of wrongs or inequities through less socially acceptable means, it is most shortsighted to inhibit projects devised to "tell it like it is" through the arts.

Recreation: Such programs were the mainstay of the three National Recreation and Parks Association projects--Baltimore,

Yuma, and Cincinatti. Recreation components were also built into a number of the projects including the Youth Civic Center, 12th and Oxford, Hartranft and the Mid Columbia Youth for Progress, and were implicitly a part of many of the others.

The N.R.P.A. programs in particular demonstrated the efficacy of recreation as an effective program for groups with relatively little experience in self-determined activities. As a relatively low common denominator device, it provides an umbrella of activity with wide appeal which makes demands on its participants. In addition, it is inexpensive, relatively easy to administer and able to accommodate large numbers of participants. The broad appeal of recreation programs also permits local youth, who may be very different in many ways, to come together for common activity.

While the N.R.P.A. projects demonstrated this phenomenon at its inception, the Youth Civic Center is illustrative of the development that can take place in a project beginning with an interest in recreation and evolving to a significant instrument for youth participation and involvement, with a complex idealogy which sees program as an instrument for bringing youth into an equalitarian, pluralistic decision-making process.

The N.R.P.A. experiences show that youth are particularly receptive to recreation, which provides an excellent beginning for participation in more complex, less immediately rewarding activities. The enthusiasm and

commitment of the young participants was frequently the strongest asset the project had. Youth groups formed out of recreation programs offered leadership (and even financial support as in Baltimore) which was often the difference between a project's success or failure.

It is difficult to conceive of a youth program which doesn't include a recreation component either implicitly or explicitly. The Mid-Columbia project began as a recreation program. During the planning grant period, however, the recreation component fell away as youngsters entrusted with more substantive youth affairs became involved in creating what was essentially a youth economic development program. While the youngsters so involved were intensely committed to the planning process and its ultimate success, the major rank and file constituency was not able to remain involved in such heady stuff. As a result of this loss of ongoing expressive activity, the youth base of the project drifted away. The contract consultant thus attempted to assist in finding local support for a recreation component so that the planning might once again operate out of a larger youth constituency.

Economic Development and Job Training: Activities designed to enable youngsters to develop an economic life of their own fell into two categories: those designed to develop appropriate, indigenous youth-managed business ventures such as RGS, Tampa Youth Board, the two Philadelphia projects, Dayton and Mid-Columbia, and those whose primary focus was to provide skills that would facilitate

impact on the job market such as New Communicators. All projects in the first category included skill training as a substantial component, and given the fact that they were all time-limited demonstration grants, the business ventures themselves were more training operations than substantive, permanent commercial enterprises.

R.G.S. was clearly the most sophisticated of the self directed business venture programs. This group conducted a number of commercial endeavors with considerable success. Success, however, is properly evaluated by programmatic, rather than commercial, standards in that the ability to plan and conduct such activities is at issue here; such abilities do not insure success in highly competitive industries where forces much beyond the reach of the project will determine outcomes. R.G.S. demonstrated the ability of youth to deal with the complexities of creating businesses with originality and vigor. On the other hand, such attempts as the laundromat by the Hartranft project represent the impossibility of a successful experience in the face of the difficulties suffered as a consequence of their status as a federally-funded project. This status rendered the group unable to deal with such exigencies as contracts, leases, purchases and the like. That R.G.S. managed to cut through the red tape which entangled Hartranft contributed substantially to their difficulties as described in earlier reports.

The major problem with all training programs is that the graduates are often unable to find employment. As numerous studies have

revealed, training often becomes an alternative to, rather than a preparation for, employment. For the factors which permit minority urban ghetto youth from entering the job market (and we acknowledge such exceptions as New Communicators) are not soluble by individual training efforts.

Services: A final program component which needs to be specified is community service as exemplified by Colonias Del Valle and the Health project of the Dayton Youth Patrol. While such components are present to some extent in any program which is truly indigenous and self-directed, Colonias is the only project that utilizes this programmatic device as their major participant activity. As noted in the R&D plan, included as Section IV of this report, we believe that there is considerable viability in this approach. The material previously submitted describing the Colonias project substantiates this belief experientially. The notion of service has been viably deomonstrated by such programs as VISTA and Peace Corps,and has always been a part of our noblesse oblige tradition. Such a notion,when applied to self-directed youth programs, is much different and much more relevant to these times because youth programs serving their own communities provide a most potent experience in the efficacy of the community process.

As indicated in the various descriptive reports, program activities are not discrete since one can readily see various program elements appearing in most projects. The sub-divisions and the examples utilized in this section are a device by which some of the functions and dysfunctions of various options can be identified and illustrated.

PROJECT RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PLAN

(COMMUNITY RESTORATION)

I HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Generally speaking, until 1961, the federal government's national policy regarding youth was directed towards influencing the services of the states in the areas of child care and protection, welfare, education and recreation. In 1961, with the passage of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act, there was formal recognition by the federal government of the need for programs for "deviant" youth between the ages of 16 and 24.

The Office of Juvenile Delinquency in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare was established as an outgrowth of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency created by President John F. Kennedy in 1961. This office had the responsibility of administering the funds of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act. Based on the assumption that juvenile delinquency was a result of community problems rather than individual pathology, the policy of this office was to fund programs attempting to change the community and its institutions rather than the individual, and it moved from an emphasis on juvenile delinquency to one of youth development. While the office had a commitment to the principle of community participation in the development and implementation of youth programs, it did not have a

formal policy of youth involvement. However, due to the personal position of some staff members, the principle of youth involvement was a central theme of many of the programs funded. One of the first examples of this was the programs of HARYOU,where youth demanded a voice in the planning of the programs under threat of refusing to participate.

The first program funded by OJD which,by deliberate design, incorporated the basic principle of youth involvement in its proposal, was the youth component of East Columbus Citizen's Organization (ECCO). In this case,the parent organization received funds (the youth were not incorporated) but gave formal sanction to the youth to determine policy and administer the program.

In the summer of 1966,in response to the riots of that year and the previous year, OEO, through White House direction, spent $35 million dollars on summer-only youth programs. This was a crash effort with no lead-time given to the obligation of funds and with a mandatory cut-off date of September 1, 1966,for expenditure of funds. The Community Action Agencies (CAAs), which were responsible for program development and disbursement of these funds,did not look favorably upon these programs. The following year (1967), the same funding procedure existed, again with three months' programming only.

In 1968,this policy was modified to allow CAAs to retain

25% of their funds for year-round programs. However, the remaining 75% still had to be spent within the three-month period. Few, if any, CAAs took advantage of this leeway because the percentage was not sufficient to allow for an adequate continuation of the programs.

In the same fiscal year, headquarters staff retained $2 million dollars of the $35 million to fund the current series of youth demonstration programs covered by the Youth Monitoring and Self-Evaluation Contract. This was done in order to experiment with the concept of youth involvement. The basis of this experiment resulted from the informal experiences of OJD/HEW in testing the basic concept. One primary criterion for the selection of programs to be funded with Research and Demonstration monies was the inclusion of youth involvement as the operating principle of the proposed program. As a result, this series represents various models that ensure that youth plan and implement the programs.

In 1969,OEO guidelines were again changed to require youth involvement in programs funded by the CAAs by establishing a youth advisory council under the structure of the Community Action Agency. This council has responsibility for recommending youth programs to be funded by the CAA, for evaluating the programs, and also for administering those programs where appropriate.

The theme of the following suggested Research and Demonstration plan is carried forward from the work currently being

done in OEO-sponsored youth projects. It represents a continuing effort in what has been a unique and distinctive contribution by OEO to youth program development.

II THE PROBLEM

Self-sufficiency, the ability to cope with the exigencies of daily living, pride in one's self and in one's people, the sense of worth that accompanies the knowledge that one can influence ones future--these and hope and optimism regarding the future are the elements which enable young people to participate effectively in the political and social processes of their communities. For a variety of well-known reasons,this hope, ability, and promise have been denied in many communities. The natural abilities and enthusiasms of young people have been eroded as problems of racism, industrialization, urbanization and bureaucratization have become endemic in our contemporary, technical society. The energies and talents of the young are palpable; even when suppressed, the resilience of youth permits these virtues to be quickly restored.

Failure to allow young people access to conventional societal roles forces them into such individual social maladjustments as drugs, criminality and other forms of social withdrawal. Collectively, youth's response to their exclusion from communal life has resulted in a widespread alienation which we have euphemistically labeled "the generation gap." This alienation, which has taken myriad forms, is best characterized by the inability of the adult community to perceive and appreciate the problems of young people. It is clear that responsibility for the distance

between the youth and adult communities does not lie with the youth. That is to say, youth are alienated by adult indifference, exclusion or misunderstanding; they are not by choice or inclination anti-adult, anti-social, or anti-community. Providing youth an opportunity for meaningful participation in the total community, or, better yet, restoring the traditional options of an open society, will effectively demonstrate the basic desire of the young for active participation. It will in effect demonstrate that the generation gap is an adult characterization of youthful intransigence which covers up the exclusions imposed on the young by the larger community.

Our hypothesis then, is that youth estrangement is caused by adult exclusion. Because it is not ingrained or long suffered, it is easily rectified and is a problem whose solution lends itself to demonstration programming. Community Restoration, the theme under which it is proposed that this R & D program be subsumed, is simply the opening of opportunities for the meaningful involvement of youth in the ongoing dynamics of their communities. The strength of such Community Restoration lies not in its complexity or inventiveness, but rather in its directness and its simplicity. It is not suggested that new social inventions must be created in order to accommodate the needs of youth in contemporary society. Rather, it is the obvious notion that those access routes which have served to integrate young people in the past be utilized in the present. It is recognized that access to the community has been differentially available, that youth from minority backgrounds, youth with poor education, youth whose health has been

impaired, rural youth and others have been particularly discriminated against by community institutions. The notion of Community Restoration does not presume to supersede or deny the need for strategems to deal with such pervasive contemporary problems as listed above. Such problems clearly do require significant social inventions. What is argued,however, is the simplistic, but not naive, notion that there are less basic options which, while they do not deal with problems of housing, employment, education, health care, and the like, will substantially serve youth and the communities in which they live by working to restore a wholeness, an esprit de corps, and continuing participation in on-going managerial and policy-making activities. This commitment entails a change in orientation regarding the reasons young people fail to become integrated into the community. For decades,workers in all phases of youth programming have focused on the provision of services geared to treatment, enrichment, the teaching of skills and socialization. Such programs were provided to rehabilitate youngsters seen as disturbed, pathological or anti-social. This approach, endemic to correctional, recreational and treatment agencies, focused on changing the individual so that he could more effectively cope with his social, educational and vocational environment.

Through successful participation in Community Restoration management and policy making, youth may very well be encouraged to venture into other aspects of the democratic process. If

federally-sponsored programs can adhere to the tenants of the pluralistic democratic process, young people may be encouraged to seek similar experiences in other social and political spheres. Such participation and experience is the essence of social reform and gradualism. Youth project members will understand that the changes called forth by their efforts will be modest. They will know, too, when tokenism and the illusion of change are substituted for substantive concessions. Community Restoration efforts are modest measures, conducted on a local level, to enhance opportunities for social success. Such projects should not be seen by their federal sponsors as shaking the social structure of the nation or redistributing its resources, even when they press for a substantive reordering of local priorities.

Through Youth Involvement in Community Restoration, participants will have a commitment to, and stake in, programs which they helped form. In contrast, they remain uninvolved and untouched by programs imposed and managed by adults and institutional officers. Young people know themselves and their problems. Given the opportunity, they will introduce relevant program components which reflect their life experience. The wisdom and insight that comes from being indigenous to the community and its problems cannot be found in expertise or officialdom. This in no way denigrates the substantial contribution to be made by trained personnel; it is rather complimentary to the expertise of adult resources. Youth are most receptive to help provided on their terms

and reflective of their own priorities. What has sometimes appeared to be resistance to outside help, is, in fact, resistance to the unrelatedness, not the competence of the helper. Youth involvement avoids this pitfall and provides a basis on which adult technical assistance can be effectively used.

The young people whom we seek to reach through Community Restoration are those who, as a result of unsatisfactory experiences with existing local institutions, have withdrawn from conventional community life into understandable (and often justifiable) alienation and hostility. These young people will ordinarily not respond to the very institutions and adults whom they see as having rejected them or blocked their access to opportunity. Even with the incentives and innovations of a federal R & D grant, the local institution remains suspect on the basis of its past performance. Youth involvement deals with this impasse in two ways; first, it is tangible evidence that the existing arrangements are being modified; second, and even more important, it provides a vehicle whereby youth can approach other youth, thus bridging the gap of distrust and hostility which often separates programs from those who will use them.

The democratic process, in and of itself, is fraught with risk and uncertainties. Totalitarianism and oligarchy can guarantee, though only for a time, stability and predictability. Youth involvement unquestionably introduces an element of risk into a project. Such risk, however, can be avoided only at the expense of the project's ability to reach and affect young people. Youth involvement is, after all,

only another designation for the democratic ethic which will inevitably determine the success of any social institution in American society. To seek such meaningful participation by young people in their programs is only to ask that they fulfill their basic responsibilities as citizens. Providing such opportunities to youth who may have reason to believe that they do not exist is surely the way to induct them into community life. Denying such opportunities to youth who may have reason to believe they do not exist, and thereby confirming their belief, is even more certainly increasing their alienation.

While the concept of youth involvement has been validated, further knowledge is necessary before it can be integrated into a widespread community institutional approach whose objective is Community Restoration. This approach, which will elicit support and commitment from adult institutions, requires from them a commitment to Community Restoration evidenced by the inclusion of youth in their direction and operation. Joint adult-youth commitment and the total community as beneficiaries are the distinctive elements which Community Restoration adds to the youth project experience garnered over the years. If there has been any learning gotten from the experience of the past decade, it has been that the benefits of successful youth programs do not accrue to the youth alone. Unfortunately, this learning has taken place out of the negative or obverse of the preceding statement; namely, that the social, economic and political deficits which are generated by the exclusion and alienation of youth are borne by the

total community, not by the youth alone. This again is the generalization upon which Community Restoration is predicated.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF AN R & D PLAN

The major theme of the suggested R & D Plan is represented by the creation of a new partnership between youth and adults. For years,we have been experimenting with adult-run programs for youth, and within the past two years,OEO has tested the concept of youth involvement and youth-run programs. There is every indication that youth-run programs can be successful. However, the past two years have also made clear that there are certain technical skills required by any program which youth cannot reasonably be expected to possess. In many situations,successes have been hampered by problems around the provision of services provided in support of the program implementation. These include administration, fiscal management, development of Boards, and the funding policies of the grantor. In fact, in those cases where programs have been viewed as a failure, there is a high probability that the basic program concept has not failed, but, rather,it hasn't even been tested because of the failure of adequate supportive services. We are now suggesting that there be a direct new partnership between youth and sensitive adults in developing, administering, and operating youth programs.

The Community Restoration Demonstration Program is predicated on the definition contained in the Thomas Glennon Memorandum

(Director of Research, OEO memorandum of April 7, 1970): "Demonstration projects are primarily a means of demonstrating a program concept. Their function is, in large part, the dissemination of information concerning these concepts."

Three general principles lie at the heart of the concept of Community Restoration. One is the creation of a new partnership between youth and adults; that is, youth and adult involvement. Two is that these programs should be directed specifically toward social and community improvement. Third, a willingness is necessary on the part of the Federal Government to enter into the partnership as a supportive third party, meaning the development of policies which foster the implementation of such programs.

TYPE OF GRANTEE (FIRST PRINCIPLE)

As stated earlier,the past two years' experience of OEO in providing Research and Demonstration funds to youth programs has indicated that severe limitations have been imposed on program implementation where certain supportive services are not present. These services have been identified above. Experience also indicates that in programs where youth involvement was not the central theme, the ability to meet youth needs was greatly diminished. Thus, those adult agencies which are directed towards youth services or the changing of social institutions serving youth also operated ineffectively. Given this set of circumstances, the obvious conclusion is that the grantee selected for these demonstration

programs should genuinely reflect that which the adult world is best capable of giving, in addition to that which the youth world can best contribute. The agency or group funded should be a combination of youth and adult participation in the management, operation, and governance of youth programs. This would probably represent the emergence of a set of new institutions specifically organized to carry out the mandate of youth-adult partnership. For example, one such combination is exemplified in the recent experience of the Real Great Society and the Puerto Rican Forum of New York City. In attempting to implement the Fashion Industries Program,which required considerable technical knowledge to determine program feasibility and to implement program objectives, R.G.S. turned to the Puerto Rican Forum for highly specialized technical assistance related to the Fashion Industries. The basic idea, momentum,and thrust were generated by the youth themselves. However, it readily became apparent to the youth that the technical knowledge required for full program implementation was beyond their capabilities. The Puerto Rican Forum thus entered a partnership with RGS on a purely voluntary basis which provided program support in terms of fiscal management, administration, and substantive consultation (in banking procedures, marketing research, legal assistance).

Although this was not a formal arrangement, the basis of youth/adult partnership is illustrated and this has led to the fulfillment of stated program objectives. Other examples of

this partnership can readily be found in the third quarterly report of the Youth Monitoring and Self-Evaluation Services Contract.

In summary, we are suggesting that new entities be found whereby the nature of this partnership can be formally structured to the design prior to funding, or that, if planning grants are contemplated, the objectives of these plans should be to accomplish this goal.

PROGRAMS FOR FUNDING (SECOND PRINCIPLE)

Community Restoration programs should be primarily directed toward community and social improvement using the new, creative partnership between youth and adults as the sponsoring agency as well as the program implementors. High priority in terms of the granting of federal dollars should be given to programs which reflect community problems in which the process of survival is the major theme. For example, the program objectives of Colonias del Valle in San Juan, Texas,is organized around the resolution of social and community problems related to sanitation, the acquisition of running water, adequate housing,and education. This program is housed in a rural area of the U.S. It should be understood that though the urban areas of the country have different kinds of survival problems, the issues inherent in the

Colonias program could be readily transferred to any urban center. (For example, sanitation, housing, and education are problems of survival in the cities as well.) The urgency of establishing creative educational and training programs within urban centers is represented by the Tampa youth program. In this situation, vital factors related to racial discrimination and lack of economic opportunity gave rise to a youth program which attempts to address these problems.

In summary, the basic principle underlying this formulation is that of systematically determining community problems and issues which are critical for poor youth within a specific geographical area, and then assisting them to develop programs which will directly lead to working out the problems identified.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SUPPORT OF YOUTH ADULT PROGRAMS (THIRD PRINCIPLE)

The following are ways the Federal Government can give direct support to these types of programs:

First: A determination should be made of the number of comprehensive programs that can be supported for approximately three years' period of time. It is recommended that approximately ten new Community Restoration Programs be funded using the basic principles outlined above as bench marks for program development and organization structure. Second: The structure and mechanism

for funding should be the same for each program. For example, each program should be awarded a planning grant covering a period of six months to a year, during which time a systematic process of program development can occur. This planning period will allow each program ample time to develop not only program concepts, but to recruit staff, develop management procedures, finalize work plans, and develop sources of technical assistance. These planning grants would carry with them a guarantee of operational funds for a minimum of two years, so that the grantee is not burdened by the uncertainty of future funding. The counterproductiveness of this fear is clearly demonstrated in those youth programs funded the last fiscal year. Third: A disciplined system of research and evaluation services should be developed so that these tasks are not the direct responsibility of the grantee. That is, arrangements should be made with third parties, mutually acceptable to the grantee and the agency, to carry out these functions. These arrangements should be completed by the end of the planning period. Fourth: A panel of private citizens, representing the professions, the community, youth and adults, should be developed which has responsibility for making recommendations to the agency regarding the approval of both planning and operational grants. This structure should be limited to eleven persons representing all aspects of community life. This recommendation seems to be particularly relevant since it is consistent with the policy of a partnership between youth and adults cooperating in major decision-making activities affecting agency policy.

And, the use of an outside panel is also consistent with the quest for objectivity in determining whether such programs are truly responsive to community needs. Fifth: An interagency committee of youth program analysts should be set up and modeled after the informal committee of analysts established in 1969 which concerned itself with intergovernmental development of youth programs. This committee would be formally recognized and be responsible for reviewing guidelines, joint funding of demonstration efforts, and making joint recommendations on legislation regarding youth programs and policy. This committee would encourage the dissemination of information between various departments charged with youth programming. The purpose of this committee is to provide the analysts of the various agencies opportunity to review their everyday efforts and problems and make appropriate recommendations to their own agencies based on the results of joint deliberations. Sixth: A system for the review and dissemination of information should be structured into the research and demonstration division of the agency. This structure would support the evaluation and research effort undertaken throughout the program year and allow for the distribution and analysis of information which may have national transferability. This would also provide OEO an opportunity to develop new legislative directions supported by concrete program experiences.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX "A"

M E M O R A N D U M

TO : All Staff of Youth Monitoring Project

FROM : Cal Fenton

DATE : June 15, 1970

SUBJECT: Collection of Hard Data

As we have mentioned many times before, Appendix "A" of our first quarterly report, (X1) provides some information regarding the kind of data we are looking for; however,we would like to be a little more explicit at this time.

I. The data to be collected should include elements of program functioning from 7/1/69 through 6/30/70 (a period of one year).

II. Data collected should include reporting of program participants who may or may not now be related to the program. If persons have dropped out, graduated to other programs, or referred elsewhere, some effort should be made to explain why and where these persons went.

*III. Each project should be reported within the following context.

A. Staff (includes consultants' rates of pay), professional background, name, age, job assignment (stress decision-making responsibility if any).

B. Volunteers--name, age, work assignment

C. Board of Directors--name, age, position on Board, income level.

D. Program Participants

1. Number of program participants 7/1/69 - 6/30/70 and number in program now.

2. Ages

3. Sex of participants

4. Marital status

5. Length of association with program, and why dropped out,etc. (if known).

6. Socio-Economic status and source of income (employment, public assistance, etc.).

7. Ethnic background

8. School attendance

9. Previous work experience

10. Nature of program participation

It should be noted that projects with a relatively large number of program participants makes data collection difficult. Possibly a sample population could be used to give evidence of certain program participation tendencies. Example--Dayton Youth Patrol.

It is also extremely important to report:

The results of training and job placement programs wherever they exist. That is, what happened to specific individuals following training and how many job placements were made, where, at what salary and HOW DID THE TRAINING OR JOB PLACEMENT AFFECT THE ECONOMIC OR SOCIAL STATUS OF THE PROGRAM PARTICIPANT. This is a difficult task and may not be feasible in all cases.

a. More money and better job?
b. More skills?
c. Better education ?
d. Better leadership qualities (how and why; example, ECCO).

If the program is designed to affect social problems or create change in general, some effort should be made to trace the nature of the change, if in fact something has changed. If not, reasons should be given.

In many situations, certain programs have not been able to become fully operational and,thus, have made no substantial impact of any kind,either in terms of the numbers of people involved or its impact on social problems. In such cases, whatever data available should be reported, however, a brief description of the barriers to full operation should also be reported (examples, Richmond, Calif., and Yuma, Arizona).

* Some aspects of this may have already been reported in our 1st or 2nd quarterly report. However, it should be repeated and changes noted.

Please send in your reports promptly so that we will be capable of carrying out a preliminary review of what is coming through.

We realize that we have not offered a specific format or structure to collect data. However, the vast differences among various programs negates the usefulness of such a disciplined approach.

If we find that these are enough common components for the systematic collection of data, we will develop a more specific outline which may be more helpful in carrying out this task.

If for any reason no data can be collected for a specific project, a clear statement should be made indicating why this situation exists and every effort should be made to assist the project in developing reporting mechanisms.

APPENDIX "B"

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CORPORATION
YOUTH MONITORING CONTRACT
CONTRACT NO. 4998

Project Director - Calvin Fenton

PROJECT PROFILE

PROGRAM CONSULTANT :

NAME OF PROJECT :

ADDRESS :

REGIONAL COORDINATOR :

DATE COMPLETED :

REGION SERVED :

DATES OF SITE VISITS :

PERSONS INTERVIEWED AND
POSITION WITH PROGRAM :

PROJECT PROFILE

(NAME OF PROGRAM)

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Briefly describe background of program and any general information which may be helpful.

I. PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Describe the overall program objectives as viewed by the Project Director, staff, and program participants. Discuss the degree to which the perceptions of program objectives are consistent with, or differ from, the project proposal funded by OEO.

II. PROGRAM ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION

Describe the organizational structure used to carry out the program objectives, the various program components, and the nature of program operations. Describe the nature of all training activities. (What is the program -- and how does the program function ?)

III. STAFF FUNCTIONING

General description of staff and staff functioning in carrying out daily work tasks. Give names and work assignment of each staff member -- list vacant positions. (Implications for training and/or other forms of Technical Assistance should be considered.)

IV. PROGRAM LEADERSHIP

Describe the major source of program leadership and other major personalities related to the project. (Role of Board of Directors, special advisory groups, Project Director's leadership, etc.)

V. YOUTH INVOLVEMENT

Describe the formal and informal structures established to encourage youth involvement. Example: Youth Council, Advisory Committees, participation on regular agency Board, Youth in Leadership positions, program supervisors or directors. Also, describe the extent to which these structures and positions are working.

VI. PROGRAM PROBLEMS

Discuss the major operational and/or staff problems as viewed by the Project Director and others in the Program.

VII. PROGRAM EVALUATION PLAN

Describe mechanisms developed or planned to be undertaken for self-evaluation and/or third party program evaluation.

VIII. FISCAL MANAGEMENT

General description of Fiscal Management procedures and current financial statute. (Use of time sheets, vouchers, etc; bookkeeping, auditing assistance; financial reporting mechanisms, fiscal management problems, etc.) NOTE: A copy of a most recent budget should be attached to report.

IX. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

Discuss Program Administration. This includes reporting procedures, use of staff conferences, inservice training, supervision, etc.

X. BOARD OF DIRECTORS

General description of the Board of Directors and their function in relationship to the project. (Frequency of meetings, membership, weak or strong posture, paper or actual existence, youth membership on board, decision-making role of youth on board.) List names and employment position of Board members, and indicate youth membership.

XI. BASE-LINE DATA

Preliminary determination of base-line data obtainable from the program. Review the nature of record-keeping procedures as they relate to program participation. Can data be collected, as presently organized, which will provide the following information:

1) Number of program participants
2) Age of participants
3) Sex
4) Length of association with program
5) Socio-economic status
6) Ethnic background
7) School attendance
8) Previous work experience

9) Source of family income

10) Nature of program participation (staff, organizational member, client, etc.).

NOTE: No attempt should be made to collect this data while undertaking the task of developing program profile. However, a determination should be made as to whether this data is currently available and will remain available throughout the project year. (Need clear statement as to what data will be available.)

XII. COMMUNITY RESPONSE TO PROGRAM

How is the project viewed by the community in general?

1) Is it controversial ?

2) Is it overlooked by, or does it seem to threaten, establishment agencies ?

3) What is the response of mass media, if any ?

4) Is it the target of abuse by other community agencies ?

5) What is the relationship to other community agencies ?

6) Is it viewed as an advocate of ghetto causes ?

XIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

- What are your recommendations for assisting this Program to carry out its objectives ?
- How best can this organization be assisted under the terms of OEO Contract ?

APPENDIX "C"

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CORPORATION
YOUTH MONITORING CONTRACT
CONTRACT NO. 4998

Project Director - Calvin Fenton

SITE VISIT REPORT

PROGRAM CONSULTANT :

NAME OF PROJECT :

ADDRESS :

REGIONAL COORDINATOR :

DATE COMPLETED :

REGION SERVED :

DATES OF SITE VISITS :

PERSONS INTERVIEWED AND
POSITION WITH PROGRAM :

SITE VISIT REPORT

(NAME OF PROGRAM)

(A report should be completed for each site visit made)

Each Site Visit Report should be completed within the frame of reference provided by the Project Profile. Topical headings will remain consistent with those offered in the Project Profile, and comments should be limited to the degree to which major program and other changes have occurred throughout the project experience.

An assumption will be made that no major change has occurred in areas which are not addressed in the Site Visit Report (using Project Profile as a general frame of reference). If for any reason the Consultant's assessment differs with the opinion offered in the Project Profile, at any point in time, this difference should be clearly noted. Changes in personnel, program operations, Board of Director memberships, financial status and other major areas of concern should be reported.

Consultants should also be aware that each month of operation brings with it new problems, and different perceptions of program progress. These areas should be carefully reviewed and reported.

The following represents general areas of major concern in reporting site visit experiences (to be used only where major changes have occurred).

I. PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

II. PROGRAM ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION

III. STAFF FUNCTIONING

IV. PROGRAM LEADERSHIP

V. YOUTH INVOLVEMENT

VI. PROGRAM PROBLEMS

VII. PROGRAM EVALUATION PLAN -- If consultation is being provided in the general area of self-evaluation, it is expected that all site visit reports will include evaluation of on-going progress being made in this area

VIII. FISCAL MANAGEMENT

IX. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

X. BOARD OF DIRECTORS

XI. BASELINE DATA

a) Collection of base-line data when available

b) Evaluation of significant changes in data collected

XII. COMMUNITY RESPONSE TO PROGRAM

XIII. SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS -- This section should include an overview of the service provided by the Project Consultant, a summary of his impressions of the program, and recommendations for future program technical assistance which can be provided by URC or directly by OEO.

APPENDIX "D"

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Project Staff DATE: January 14, 1970

FROM: Calvin Fenton, Charles Grosser and Elaine Hudson

SUBJECT: Progress Report, Self-Evaluation, and January 21 and 22 Staff Conference.

At our October 17 and 18 staff conference we spent considerable time attempting to develop a self-evaluation model which would define and identify the youth involvement component in each of the projects. In addition, the model was to incorporate information pertaining to the various other aspects of program success and failure, and was to be applicable to each of the fifteen constituent programs. At the same time,it was to be used to provide a means whereby aggregate information about youth programs in general could be collated. To meet these requirements it became necessary for us to try and develop an outline which would define youth involvement in both generic and specific terms. We also had to develop a perspective which could identify those program elements which constituted real or genuine involvement, in contrast to token or illusionary involvement. These issues, coupled with the problem of specifying the project's program objectives, determining if they were to be implemented and if not, why not, made our task virtually impossible. Though we struggled with the issues, it became clear that each time we modified or extended our outline to include specific contingencies related either to youth involvement, self-

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CORPORATION • 4301 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008 • (202) 244-9210

evaluation program goals or the idiosyncratic qualities of a given project we precluded other possible options.*

It seems clear from our experience in October that generating a single model for the program analysis of a group of projects as diverse as ours is not viable. This is reinforced by recent developments in OEO and within the various projects themselves. As you know, continued funding of many youth programs by OEO is now a matter of considerable uncertainty. In some cases,decisions to terminate or not to renew have already been made. In the case of some individual projects, such as the three cities under the National Recreation and Parks Association, the programs have developed so differently from the original proposal as to change the basis for evaluation completely. Because of the diversity of the various projects, the unique factors which have influenced their development and their various stages with regard to funding, we believe that it will be necessary to develop individual assessments and self-evaluation schemes for each project. We are bringing staff together for a two day meeting January 21 and 22 to undertake this task.

The following is a brief rundown on the program status and termination dates on each of the youth development projects:

1. Syracuse (URC Consultant: Lloyd Johnson. Extension to January, 1970)

   a. Proposal requesting refunding is now under consideration in

*The memo we used for discussion, Consultant's Outline for Program Analysis:A Statement on Youth Involvement, submitted to OEO and the first round of reports from the Western Region are included for your information.

Washington, D. C. Our task would be to build a self-evaluation component if it is refunded.

b. Consultant activity held up pending funding decision or upon special request by OEO and/or the youth program.

2. Real Great Society (URC Consultant: Conrad Graves. Funded to August, 1970, possible extension to October, 1970, by accruals.)

a. Will operate for the balance of the contract year. Self-evaluation and youth involvement is built into the current program. Will not be refunded.

b. Consultant activity in ongoing program. (Self-evaluation and general technical assistance.)

3. Commission on Community Relations, Tampa (URC Consultant: Lloyd Johnson. Funded thru June 1, 1970, possible two month extension by accruals.)

a. Self-evaluation and youth involvement by URC staff has really just begun. Project needs a self-evaluation model and day-to-day technical assistance.

b. Consultant activity as above.

4. Hartranft (URC Consultant: Conrad Graves. Funded thru May 30, 1970.)

a. Project's program is undiscernible and its status uncertain. OEO now considering withdrawal of funds.

b. No consultant activity pending outcome.

5. 12th and Oxford (URC Consultant: Conrad Graves. Will probably be extended to June 30, 1970.)

a. It is likely that this program will receive continued support from OEO.

b. Consultant has just made initial contact. Project's needs are open. Presumably will require the introduction of a self-evaluation scheme. Youth involvement in the past appears to have been substantial.

6. National Recreation and Parks Association

Baltimore (URC Consultant: Shirley Jones)

Yuma (URC Consultant: Dan Robbin)

Cincinnati (URC Consultant: Bill Pickard) Funded thru April 30, 1970.

a. In all three of these projects,NRPA has failed to operationalize its proposal and test its premises. The only viable option appears to be in direct funding to the local neighborhood groups for the operation of local self-controlled, recreation-park facilities.

b Consultants' tasks should be the development of individual proposals for direct funding (as per above) including self-evaluation and youth involvement components.

7. Mission Rebels (URC Consultant: Dan Robbin. Funded until January, 1970.)

a. Status uncertain, the likelihood is that the program will be discontinued.

b. Consultant activity in abeyance.

8. Colonias del Valle, San Juan, Texas (URC Consultant: Dan Robbin. University of Utah planning proposal until January, 1970.)

a. Project has been funded to develop a proposal which is forthcoming.

b. Consultant is assisting in constructing the proposal which will include self-evaluation and youth involvement components.

9. Mid-Columbia Youth for Progress, The Dalles (URC Consultant: Dan Robbin and James Goodman. Planning proposal until January, 1970.)

a. Proposal for funding has been completed. We have not seen the proposal as yet. It should have a self-evaluation component built into it.

b. Consultant to facilitate the inclusion and operationalization

of self-evaluation component in the proposal.

10. Neighborhood House, Richmond (URC Consultant: Dan Robbin. Funded until July, 1970.)

    a. Operational problems, particularly with parent agency, have affected this project.

    b. Consultant needs to develop an approach which will circumvent the parent agency should this be necessary to provide meaningful youth involvement and self-evaluation.

11. Youth Civic Center, Columbus (ECCO) (URC Consultant: Bill Pickard. Funded until May 1, 1970.)

    a. The project's current task is to develop a new proposal for refunding which should be the product of a self-evaluation process. This should commence immediately.

    b. Consultant has just contacted the project. Relationship and tasks to be evolved.

12. Dayton Youth Patrol, Dayton (URC Consultant: Bill Pickard. Funded through October, 1970.)

    a. Program is well established and active. They are ready for, and have accepted the concept of, self-evaluation; what they need is a specific design.

    b. Consultant has just contacted the project. After establishing rapport, he will need to help them induce an on-going scheme for self-evaluation.

As can be seen from the above, our assumptions regarding project differences are most valid. Some of our programs are terminating, others are ongoing, and some (as many as five) are actually at the point of developing original proposals. All the projects are so distinctive that our

charge to facilitate youth involvement and introduce self-evaluation can only be implemented through plans individually tailored to each particular program.

For example, a major problem in Richmond is the intransigence of the parent agency. We have seen Neighborhood House stifle all attempts the youth project has made to act independently. The youth in program appear reluctant to engage in self-governance and evaluation. We are, however, unable to make any judgement as to whether this unwillingness is genuine disinterest on the part of the young people. Their reluctance may very well be a result of an accurate appraisal of the lack of any genuine option for independent action. Perhaps it would be possible to develop an independent URC youth committee whose responsibilities to the project would be carried out through our sponsorship, thus bypassing the obstacles presented by the parent agency.

Evaluating such a possibility and/or developing other options to accomplish our objectives will be the kind of task we shall undertake at our upcoming meeting. All staff will address each project's particular problems individually.

The enclosed materials and previous reports and proposals in your possession will provide you with the necessary background information. We would ask you to take reponsibility for thinking through possible approaches to your own programs. These ideas can then be shared with the group and this will be the basis for developing discussion.

We look forward to seeing you on January 21st.